

2411

[illegible]

[illegible]

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE
FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

MOWBRAY VELTE

ACCEPTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
JULY, 1922

CATALOGED BY

Rh

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY



ALLAMA IQBAL LIBRARY



44273

ET 01

RG1

44273

13.9.68

STP
RECEIVED

822.4

V548B

FOREWORD

Thomas Heywood is a dramatist, whose work can be approached from many different angles. His versatility was immense, and when a man is versatile there are many ways of looking at his literary production. This study purposes to confine itself to one thing only, the bourgeois elements in his plays, and therefore the plays in which, in especial, these elements are apparent are more stressed than those which reflect some other phase of his dramatic work. His non-dramatic work is not considered at all, the city pageants and "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's" being regarded as non-dramatic as well as his poetry and prose works.

The study has been divided into five main parts; four dealing with his chronicle history plays, his classical plays, his romantic plays and plays of adventure by land and sea, and his dramas of contemporary life respectively; while the fifth is an endeavour to sum up the conclusions arrived at in the four earlier parts and to relate them to each other.

As a preliminary to these five parts, which comprise the real body of the thesis, is a short account of Heywood's life, based primarily on the accepted Heywood authorities, Aronstein ("Anglia Zeitschrift" 37), Katherine Lee Bates, and of course the "Dictionary of National Biography." It does not pretend to be a complete biography but is intended only as a brief guide to the reader, giving merely the more important facts of the dramatist's life.

A complete list of the extant plays with dates, and of other works ascribed to him is also included immediately after the biography. The bibliography appears at the end of the thesis. Necessarily, only actual known works have any value in this study, so that extant plays which are doubtfully ascribed to Heywood are of minor importance, and so treated, though they are not entirely ignored.

I cannot adequately express my gratitude to those who have assisted me in the production of this thesis. To Professor Thomas Marc Parrott, who has taken the deepest interest in such work as I have been able to do and who has helped me

4 *Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood*

with many invaluable suggestions, I am under an especial debt. His vast scholarly knowledge of the whole field of Elizabethan drama and his enthusiasm for all effort in this field have proved to me an immense inspiration. I am indebted to Professor G. M. Harper, among many other kindnesses at all times shown to me during my course of study, for having very kindly read through the MSS. of this work. Professor C. W. Kennedy also read through the MSS. and gave me much useful and friendly advice in regard to it. Without the guidance of these advisers I could have accomplished little.

Lahore, India,
1924.

F. MOWBRAY VELTE.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE LIFE OF THOMAS HEYWOOD	7
CHRONICLE HISTORIES	20
THOMAS HEYWOOD'S DRAMATIZATIONS OF CLASSICAL THEMES	40
ROMANTIC DRAMAS AND DRAMAS OF LAND AND SEA ADVENTURE	65
DRAMAS OF CONTEMPORARY LIFE	100
AN ANALYSIS OF THE BOURGEOIS ELEMENTS IN THE PLAYS	127
BIBLIOGRAPHY	147

[illegible]

THE LIFE OF THOMAS HEYWOOD

Comparatively little is known of the early life of Thomas Heywood, and what is known has been gained principally from references to it in his own works. The exact date of his birth will probably never be discovered, though that it could not have been "much later than 1575," and was probably about the year 1572, seems pretty generally accepted. That he was a Lincolnshire man we learn from "A Funerall Elegy upon the Death of Sir George St. Poole, of Lincolnshire, my Country-man," printed with other literary flotsam and jetsam in his "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's,"¹ that he was of a respectable family of the more prosperous middle-class seems likely from the dedication of "The English Traveller" to Sir Henry Appleton, Kt., Bart., etc., in which he speaks of "those frequent courtesies which interchangeably past betwixt your selfe and that good old gentleman, mine unkle (Master Edmund Heywood) whom you pleased to grace by the title of Father"² and of "that worthy gentleman, your friend and my country-man, Sir William Elvish,"³ whom (who for his unmerited love many wayes extended towards me) I much honour." Master Edmund Heywood,⁴ uncle to the poet, called father by Sir Henry Appleton, seems to have been guardian to the young nobleman, and was apparently a man held high in respect by the community. Thus, though we know nothing more of Heywood's

¹ "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's," London (1637), p. 252. Also in verses prefaced to "The Union of Honour," by James Yorke, a Lincoln blacksmith, Heywood speaks of Yorke as his friend and country-man.

² "The English Traveller" (Pearson Ed., Vol. IV, p. 3).

³ Katharine Lee Bates, "A Conjecture as to Thomas Heywood's Family" ("Eng. and Germ. Phil.," Vol. XII, pp. 93-109). Miss Bates, on the basis of a pedigree from the "Visitation of Lincolnshire" (1634), proves that Sir William Elvish was connected by marriage with Sir George St. Poole.

⁴ Edmund Heywood's will is preserved at Somerset House, a bequest to "Thomas Heywoode and his wief" establishes the fact that Heywood was married. The will mentions Sir Henry Appleton twice. It was made Oct. 7, 1624, and proved Feb. 1, 1626. Miss Bates says the name of Heywood is common in other wills of the period, but in none of these is kinship with the dramatist indicated.

descent, we dare, I think, assume that he was of pretty good family.¹

Of his education we know nothing except that he was probably a Cambridge man. In the "Apology for Actors" he mentions "his residence at Cambridge"² and William Cartwright (d. 1687) in the dedication to "The Actor's Vindication" (1658), a reprint of Heywood's "Apology," asserts that he was a fellow of Peterhouse.³ Investigations by Ward, however, lead him to the conclusion that "it is practically certain that he (Heywood) never held a fellowship at Peterhouse,"⁴ for there is no record of him in the college archives. Heywood's extensive learning, however, is almost convincing proof that he was a University man. His use of Greek and Latin allusions, his attempts to popularize the classics in the four "Ages," and "The Rape of Lucrece," his translations of Ovid,⁵ Sallust,⁶ Lucian,⁷ Apuleius,⁸ Plautus,⁹ etc., and his familiarity with neo-Latin Renaissance literature, Erasmus, Jacob Cats, Jon Everard, Castiglione, etc., all reveal the wideness of his reading, and the fact that he had a trained mind. To the university, too, is to be traced perhaps his first initiation into dramatic work, for he states how at Cambridge he saw "tragedyes, comedyes, historyes, pastorals and shewes publikely acted,"¹⁰ and points out the importance of such training in acting at an educational institution.

¹ Katharine Lee Bates has endeavoured, with doubtful success, to prove that he was the son of Christopher Heywood, son of Richard Heywood, a London barrister who held manors both in Kent and Lincolnshire. "A Conjecture as to Thomas Heywood's Family" ("Eng. and Germ. Phil.," Vol. XII).

² "Apology for Actors" ("Shakes. Soc. Pub.," p. 28).

³ In "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon" Sir Boniface asserts that he was "student in Brazenose," and Sencer disguised as a rival pedant, replies "*Petrus dormit securus*; I was, sir, of Peterhouse." On the basis of this, Fleay concludes, without hesitation, that Heywood took the part of Sencer.

⁴ "Cambridge, Hist. of Eng. Lit.," Vol. VI, p. 94; and Ward, "A History of Eng. Dramatic Lit.," Vol. II, p. 551.

⁵ "De Arte Amandi" and "De Remedio Amoris," both lost. Also Metamorphoses in "Gunaikeion," etc.

⁶ "Translation of Sallust" (1608).

⁷ In "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's."

⁸ "Love's Maistresse."

⁹ "The Captives," "The English Traveller," "The Ages."

¹⁰ "Apology for Actors" ("Shakes. Soc. Pub.," p. 28).

From Cambridge—that is, granted he studied there—Heywood went to London, and at once took to dramatic work, the only real field at the time for one who wished to support himself by literary work. On October 30, 1596, his name appears for the first time in "Henslowe's Diary," when Henslowe loans the Admiral's Men thirty shillings "for hawode's booke," but he was certainly an actor and playwright before this date. On March 25, 1603 he was bound for two years to serve Henslowe in the Admiral's Company. By the terms of his contract,¹ he was required to act exclusively for the Admiral's Company, though no like restriction seems to have been placed on his composition of plays. Two plays are ascribed to him by Henslowe between the years 1598-1599,² but neither has been preserved. From February, 1599 to September, 1602, there is no mention of him in the "Diary" though "Edward IV" entered in the Stationers' Register August 28, 1599, and written for Derby's men, must have been composed about this date. Of Heywood's exact connection with the Earl of Derby's Company nothing is yet known.

In 1602 he is again with Henslowe, for several plays composed by him are recorded in the "Diary."³ From 1602-19 Heywood was once more a permanent member of a company. At first the company was called The Earl of Worcester's Men,⁴ but in 1603 it was taken over by Queen Anne and she remained its patron till her death in 1619. The Queen's Players performed at court on various occasions, at Christmas time in 1604, 1605,

¹ J. Tucker Murray, "Eng. Dramatic Companies," Vol. I, pp. 292-3, and Vol. II, p. 141.

² "War without blows and love without Suit," Henslowe 6/12/1598, 26/1/1599 (identified by Fleay in "Biog. Chronicle of Eng. Drama" with "The Thracian Wonder" but without adequate proof), and "Joan as Good as my Lady," 10/2/1599, 12/2/1599.

³ "The London Florentine," 2 Pts., Pt. I, Heywood and Chettle, 17, 20, 22/12 1602, 7/1/1603, Pt. II, Chettle alone, 12/3/1603. "Albere Galles," with Smith, 4/9/1602. Additions to "Cutting Dick," 20/9/1602. "Christmas Comes but Once a Year," with Chettle, Dekker and Webster, 2-26/11/1602. "The Blind eat many a Fly," 24/11/1602, 15/12/1602, 7/1/1603. An unknown piece with Chettle, 14/1/1603. "Marshall Osric," 20/9/1602, 30/9/1602, 3/11/1602. "Lady Jane or The Overthrow of the Rebels," Pt. I, with Chettle, Dekker, Smith and Webster, 15/10/1602, 21/10/1602; Pt. II, 27/10/1602, 6/11/1602. Since identified with "Sir Thomas Wyatt."

⁴ J. Tucker Murray, "Eng. Dramatic Companies," Vol. II, pp. 52-56.

1610, 1611 and 1614. On the formal entry of James I into London, March 15, 1604, ten members of this organization, among them Heywood, took part in the triumphal procession wearing cloaks of red cloth. He was, then, an actor of distinction in the Company even at this early date, and took a leading part in its affairs. Proof of this is to be found in the frequent references to him in "Henslowe's Diary," and in the fact that he is prominently mentioned in the proceedings of two law-suits, in which the Company was involved.¹ Moreover, when Queen Anne died, March 2, 1619, representatives of her London and provincial companies attended the funeral, Heywood's name being fifth on the list.² With him were associated, particularly, Christopher Beeston, Richard Perkins, Robert Pallant, and Robert Lee, while the theatres at which the company performed were "The Rose" (1603), "The Curtain" (1604), "The Boar's Head" (1604), "The Red Bull" (1609), and the "Cockpit" (1617). The last-named was partially wrecked by the prentices of London on March 4, 1617, but was rebuilt later and re-christened the "Phoenix." Both the "Red Bull" and the "Cockpit" seem to have been frequented largely by the masses, and Prynne in his "Histriomastix" (1633), p. 390, attacks them both for their immorality. The nature of the audiences at these theatres is important in its influence on Heywood's dramatic work, since it made him primarily a writer for the bourgeoisie.

During this period from 1603-19, Heywood was tremendously active. He was actor and playwright combined;³ wrote constantly for his company alone or in collaboration; read the manuscripts of prentice-playwrights and edited them;⁴ and did his best to live up to the ideal he himself set up for his profession in "The Apology for Actors" (1612), namely, that players should "be of substance, of government, of sober lives, and temperate carriages, house-keepers, and contributory to all the duties enjoined them, equally with them that are

¹ J. Tucker Murray, "English Dramatic Companies," Vol. I, pp. 193-6.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 196-7.

³ The frequent references in Henslowe of payments to him of sums of money for properties seem to indicate that he had some sort of financial position in the Company as well.

⁴ *Vide* notes on "Nobody and Somebody," and "Hoffman," in lists of plays by Heywood to be found in this Thesis.

rank't with the most bountiful."¹ To this period we owe the best of his work.

After 1619 the Queen's Company was split in two, the greater number of the players going back to the "Red Bull," while the rest under Beeston played in the "Cockpit" or "Phoenix" as Princess Elizabeth's men,² and after 1625 under Queen Henrietta as the Queen's Comedians.³ Heywood probably allied himself to the latter Company, but was no longer an active player since his name is not mentioned on the list of its members. The fact that all his dramas were produced by the "Cockpit" Players seems fairly conclusive evidence that he was interested in this troop, at least as a composer of plays for them.

Until 1631 Heywood wrote for the theatre exclusively. He had no desire to be "voluminously read," and whenever possible kept his plays from the press. Occasionally, however, pirated editions forced him in self-defense to put out authorized versions of his own plays, as the dedication to "The Rape of Lucrece," published 1608, makes clear. In the dedication, as in those to "The Foure Prentises of London" (first Ed. prob. 1610), "The Golden Age" (1611), and "If You Knowe Not me, You Knowe No Bodie," he apologizes for committing his plays to the press, saying that some have "accidentally come into the printer's hands," so "corrupt and mangled, copied only by the eare"⁴ that he is ashamed to own them, and that, therefore, he has been induced to publish them himself. He decries, however, the attempt of some writers to profit by a "double sale of their labours, first to the stage, and after to the presse,"⁵ and insists that any such motive is far from his mind. The fact that in 1631 he authorizes publication of his plays, even before pirated editions of them appear, indicates that in this year he lost connection with his troop entirely and became more or less of a dramatic and literary free-lance. "The Challenge for Beautie" and "The Late Lancashire Witches," for example, were written not for the Cockpit Troop, but for the King's

¹ "Apology for Actors" (Shakes. Soc. Ed., p. 44).

² J. Tucker Murray, "English Dramatic Companies," Vol. I, p. 255.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 265.

⁴ "The Rape of Lucrece," Dedication (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, P. 164).

⁵ *Ibid.*

Players, while "Love's Maistresse" was written for court production by the Queen's Comedians.

Heywood, however, never believed in complete editions, such as were issued of Ben Jonson's Works (1616) or the first folio of Shakespeare (1623). A great number of his plays thus were lost soon after their production, while others remained in the hands of the companies for which they had been composed. "Fortune by Land and Sea" was never published till 1655, some years after his death, while the discovery and printing of "The Captives" took place in 1885.¹ Obviously Heywood was in no hurry to rush into print; in fact he deemed it somewhat undignified.

From 1634-35 he seems to have ceased writing drama, and to have turned to poetry and prose. Shackerley Marmion (1602-34) in lines to Heywood, "his worthie friend," extols the versatility of his genius since his pen commanded

". . . all history, all actions, counsels, decrees, men, manners, states and factions, plays, epicediums, odes and lyricks, translations, epitaphs and panegyricks."²

Earlier in his career, in 1613, he had written "A Marriage Triumph on the Nuptials of the Prince Palatine and the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of James I," and he now began to write a series of seven pageants for the Lord Mayor's Show.³ In this he followed Munday, Dekker and Middleton, and certainly was fitted by temperament and knowledge of the citizen mind for the task. A number of prose works also belong to this period, Heywood's last work probably being "The Life of Merlin, surnamed Ambrosius, His Prophecies and Predictions interpreted and their truth made good by our English Annals." A contemplated work on contemporary poets was either never actually completed or has unfortunately been lost.⁴

¹ A. H. Bullen, "Old English Plays" (1885).

² "Heywood's Dramatic Works" (Pearson Ed., Vol. I).

³ "London's Jus Honorarium" (1631); "Londini Artium et Scientiarum Scaturigo" (1632); "Londini Emporia" (1633); "Londini Sinus Salutis" (1635); "Londini Speculum" (1637); "Londini Porta Pietatis" (1638); "Londini Status Pacatus" (1639). For the second and third on this list *vide* F. W. Fairholt, "Lord Mayor's Pageants," Part I, Perry Soc. Pub., 1843; for the others *vide* Pearson Ed.

⁴ T. Heywood, "Dramatic Works," Pearson Ed., Vol. I, Introduction, pp. xli, xlii. Mentioned by Richard Braithwaite in his "Scholar's Medley" (1614)

After 1641 we hear nothing more of Heywood. However, he appears to have lived some years and is mentioned as still living in "The Satire against Separatists" (1648).¹ It was very soon after this that he died, 1650 having been set as a possible date of his death. Of his character more will be said hereafter, for it is through the plays which we are to study that the frank, kindly, patriotic and religious nature of the man is revealed.

DATES OF EXTANT PLAYS BY HEYWOOD

An asterisk denotes plays somewhat doubtfully ascribed to him

			<i>Published.</i>
The Foure Prentises of London	1594-95	(First extant Ed.)	1615
		(First Ed. probably)	1610
The Golden Age 1595-96		1611
The Silver Age "		1613
The Brazen Age "		1613
If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe		Part I	1605
Nobodie (1 & 2)	Soon after 1596	.. II	1606
Edward IV (1 & 2)	Feb.-Aug., 1599		1600
The Royall King and Loyall			
Subject 1601		1637
*How a Man May Choose a			
Good Wife 1602		1602
The Faire Maid of the West	.. 1600-3		1631
*The Fayre Mayde of the Ex-			
change 1600-3		1607
The Wise Woman of Hogsdon	1604		1638
The Rape of Lucrece	after 1603		1608
The Woman Kilde with Kindnesse	1603		1607

as contemplated. In the "Nine Books of various History concerning Women" (1624), Heywood tells us the title is to be "The Lives of all the Poets, Modern and Foreign." It was still in progress in 1635, when in the "Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels," p. 245, we find the statement: "In proceeding further I might have forestalled a worke, which hereafter (I hope) by God's assistance, to commit to the publick view; namely, the Lives of all the Poets, Forreine and Moderne, from the first before Homer, to the novissimi and last, of what nation or language soever." Pearson and Ward seem inclined to believe that it was actually begun, with reason as it seems to me.

¹ T. Heywood, "Dramatic Works" (Pearson Ed., Vol. I, Introduction, p. xxv).

14 *Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood*

*The Tryall of Chevalry	..	1597(?) S.R.	1604 Pub.	1605.
Fortune by Land and Sea	..	1607-9		1655
The Iron Age	..	after 1610		1632
The Captives	..	1624	First printed by Bullen	1885
The English Traveller	..	1625 <i>circa</i>		1633
*Dicke of Devonshire	..	1626	First printed by Bullen	1885
A Maydenhead Well Lost	..	1633		1634
Love's Maistresse	..	1633-4		1636
The Late Lancashire Witches		1634		1634
A Challenge for Beautie	..	1634-5		1636

To this list of extant plays might be added :

1. "Nobody and Somebody,"¹ entered in the Stationers' Register, March 12, 1606, and first printed, according to a statement in the edition, in the "Tudor Facsimile Texts" in 1592. Fleay has ascribed this play to Heywood largely on the basis of the use of the spelling "ey" for "ay" or "I," a usage which, he says, is peculiar to Heywood. He has then proceeded to identify it with the lost "Albere Galles," by Heywood and Wentworth Smith (Henslowe, Sept. 4, 1602), claiming that "Albere Galles" is Henslowe's corruption of Archigallo, the name of the King in "Nobody and Somebody." The clown parts of the play and the final revision, he states, are by Heywood; the rest by the other hand, presumably Smith. Greg² says "the identification appears reasonable," but does not agree with Fleay's proposed division. Personally, I do not feel Fleay's arguments at all convincing. There is nothing in the style of this play, part chronicle-history, part crude morality, that strikes me as being at all in Heywood's characteristic manner. If it is his, it could not possibly have been written by him as late as 1602, for it was in 1603 that he was doing his most excellent work. The date set by the editor of the "Tudor Facsimile Text" would also argue against 1602. Under the circumstances I have disregarded this very crude drama, obviously by a prentice hand, in my study of the bourgeois elements in Heywood's plays. I cannot believe it to have been by Heywood.

2. "Hoffman," entered in Henslowe, December 29, 1602, when he paid Chettle five shillings for it on behalf of the

¹ Fleay, "Blog. Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. I, pp. 293-94.

² Greg, "Henslowe's Diary," Part II, p. 230.

Admiral's Men. Fleay¹ assigns Act III, Sc. ii, Act IV, Sc. iii, in which Charles and Sarlois occur instead of Otho, to Heywood. Greg² asserts that the play is certainly by "one hand only," and says the alternative names, Charles and Sarlois for Otho, are due to revision not collaboration. Critics unite in assigning it to Chettle, and all the evidence points to him. Heywood may, perhaps, as Greg suggests, have done some revising.

3. "The Thracian Wonder," published in 1661, by F. Kirkman as by John Webster and William Rowley. Fleay³ believes Kirkman to have been wrong in attributing this play to Webster and Rowley, and identifies it with "War without Blows and Love without Suit (Strife)" (Henslowe, December 6, 1598, January 26, 1598) on the basis of two passages in it, *viz.* Act I, Sc. ii: "You never shall again renew your suit"; Act III, Sc. ii: "Here was a happy war finished without blows. He argues that "it was probably like many other of Heywood's plays, revived for the Queen's Men (c. 1607), when Rowley and Webster were writing for them; whence the absurd attribution of the authorship to them by Kirkman." At the same time, he says in the same volume that the probable date of production is about 1617 and that the plot is from William Webster's poem, "Curan and Argentyle" (1617). This only confuses matters. Greg says the source is Greene's "Menaphon" (1689), and that "it might therefore be a Heywood play." The attribution to Heywood, however, is very problematical.

4. "The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt," published in 1607, as by Dekker and Webster, is without question a condensed form of "Lady Jane," or "The Overthrowe of Rebelles," Parts I and II. For Part I, Henslowe paid Chettle, Dekker, Heywood, Smith and Webster, October 16 and 21, 1602, £8. For Part II he paid Dekker, October 27, 1602, in earnest five shillings. Fleay⁴ believes the parts written by Dekker and Webster "were cobbled into a play called "The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt." Stoll, in his study of John Webster (1905) gives almost the whole to Dekker. At any

¹ Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. I, p. 291.

² Greg, "Henslowe's Diary," Part II, p. 226.

³ Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. I, p. 287.

⁴ "Biographical Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. II, p. 269.

rate, Heywood's part in "Sir Thomas Wyatt" is very small. Rupert Brooke ("John Webster," p. 221) sums the matter up by saying "Heywood's hand is occasionally to be suspected." This is as far as one dare go.

5. "Appius and Virginia," published in 1654 by Humphrey Moseley as by John Webster. The fact that this play was entirely unlike the rest of Webster's work was long recognised, but Rupert Brooke ("John Webster and Elizabethan Drama," Appendix I) was the first to suggest that Heywood was the true author. He states, however, that Webster probably revised the opening scene and Act IV, Sc. i, the trial scene. He reaches this conclusion: (1) by restating emphatically the fact that the play "æsthetically and as a whole" is very different from Webster's known work; (2) by arguing that the characters of the play, especially the clown, the Machiavellian villain, and Virginia, the virgin, are more like Heywood's than Webster's; (3) by showing that the blank verse is stricter and more formal than "Webster's loose impressionistic iambics with their vague equivalence and generous handling"; (4) by making clear that the vocabulary and language with its Latin words resembles that of Heywood. In proof of the last he cites a large number of unusual words in the play, which appear elsewhere almost exclusively in Heywood; and at this point his arguments are most convincing. Brooke then points out the connection of Heywood with Webster and of both dramatists with Beeston and Queen Anne's Men, and from this demonstrates that Webster may have revised the work. Certain parallel passages in "Appius and Virginia" and Webster's plays are thus explained; for Webster, in these cases, may have been quoting from the work of his friend Heywood. On the whole Brooke is very convincing, and I am inclined to believe him in the right. Still, under the circumstances one is not justified in ascribing it outright to Heywood, and considering it with his known plays.

6. "A Warning for Fair Women," published anonymously in 1599, as it had been "lately diverse times acted by the Right Honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his Servants." Joseph Quincy Adams, Jr. ("Mod. Lang. Ass. Publ.," Vol. XXVIII, pp. 594-620), attributes this play to Heywood. His belief is based in the main on his strong personal impressions of the play, and on

the fact that it is a domestic drama such as Heywood was particularly skilled in writing. The evidence he adduces in support of his contention is interesting, but I cannot without further proof feel that the play is Heywood's. Many of his parallels in phrase and sentence are particularly shaky. Still the matter perhaps deserves further thorough investigation.

7. "Captain Thomas Stukely," entered S.R. Aug. 11, 1600, and published in 1605. Joseph Quincy Adams, Jr. ("Journal of English and Germanic Philology," Vol. XV, pp. 107-29), believes this play to be a revision of the earlier "Stewtly," recorded by Henslowe as acted by the Admiral's Men on December 11, 1596. He is convinced "that 'Thomas Heywood was responsible for at least a share of the play, and in particular for the magnificent Stewkely scenes.'" His evidence is similar to that in his treatment of the authorship of "A Warning for Fair Woman," but is much more convincing. A comparison made by him of the play with Heywood's "If You Know Not Me" is particularly suggestive. I am inclined to think he is right, for the play is in line with much of Heywood's known work.

8. "Pericles." D. L. Thomas, in his article "On the Play Pericles" ("Englische Studien," 1908, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 210-33), suggests that Heywood may be the author of the un-Shakespearian scenes of this play.

Lost Plays ascribed to Heywood

1. "War Without Blows and Love Without Suit (Strife)" (Henslowe, 6/12/1598, 26/1/1598) v. under "The Thracian Wonde."

2. "Joan as Good as my Lady" (Henslowe, 10/2/1599, 12/2/1599).

3. "The London Florentine," 2 Pts. Part I, Heywood and Chettle (Henslowe, 17, 20, 22/12/1602, 7/1/1603). Part II, Chettle alone (Henslowe, 12/3/1603).

4. "Albere Galles" with Smith (Henslowe, 4/9/1602) v. under "Nobody and Somebody."

5. Additions to "Cuttying Dick" (Henslowe, 20/9/1602).

6. "Lady Jane" or "The Overthrowe of the Rebelles," 2 Pts. Part I, Heywood, Chettle, Dekker, Smith and Webster (Henslowe, 15 and 21/10/1602); Part II, Dekker alone (Hens-

18 *Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood*

lowe, 27/10/1602). Identified with "The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt," q.v.

7. "Marshal Osric," with Smith. (Henslowe 20-30/9/1602, for properties 3/11/1602). Identified by Fleay with "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject," q.v.

8. "Christmas Comes But Once a Year," with Chettle, Dekker, and Webster (Henslowe 2-26/11/1602).

9. "The Blind Eat Many a Fly" (Henslowe, 26/11/1602, 7/1/1603).

10. An unknown piece with Chettle (Henslowe, 14/1/1603).

11. "The Bold Beachams" traditionally reported as written by Heywood.

12. "The Apprentice Prize" with Brome (Stationers' Register, 8/4/1654 composed about 1634).

13. "The Life and Death of Sir Martin Skink," with Brome (Stationer's Register, 8/4/1654, composed 1634 c.).

Heywood's City Pageants

1. London's Jus Honorarium	..	1631	Pub. 1631
2. Londini Artium et Scientiarum			
Scaturigo	..	1632	,, 1632
3. Londini Emporia	..	1633	,, 1633
4. Londini Sinus Salutis	..	1635	,, 1635
5. Londini Speculum	..	1637	,, 1637
6. Londini Porta Pietatis	..	1638	,, 1638
7. Londini Status Pacatus	..	1639	,, 1639

Pageants 2 and 3 are described in F. W. Fairholt's "Lord Mayor's Pageants," Part I (Percy. Soc. Pub., 1843). The rest are to be found in the Pearson Edition of Heywood's Works.

Semi-Dramatic Works

"Pleasant Dialogues and Drama's including Prologues," published 1637.

Poetic Works

"Troia Britannica" or "Great Britain's Troy" (1609).

"Marriage Triumph; or the Nuptials of the Prince Palatine and the Princess Elizabeth" (1613).

"The Life and Death of Hector" (1614). A modernization of Lydgate's "Troy Book."

"The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels. Their names, orders, and offices. The fall of Lucifer with his Angells" (1635).

"Reader, here you'll plainly see, Judgment perverted by these three; a Priest, a Judge, a Patentee" (1641).

Prose Works

Translation of "Sallust" (1608).

"An Apology for Actors" (1612).

"Gunaikeion or Nine Books of Various History Concerninge Women, inscribed by the Nine Muses" (1624). Reprinted 1657, as "The General History of Woman."

"England's Elizabeth, Her Life and Troubles during Her Minoritie from the Cradle to the Crown" (1632).

"A True Description of His Majesty's Royall Ship, built this yeare 1637, at Woolwich in Kent. To the Great Glory of our English Nation and not Paraleld in the whole Christian World" (1637).

"Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine of the Most Worthy Women of the World: Three Jews, Three Gentiles, Three Christians" (1640).

"The Life of Merlin, surnamed Ambrosius, His Predictions Interpreted and their Truth made Good by our English Annalls" (1641).

CHRONICLE HISTORIES

Although the chronicle history plays were immensely popular with the Elizabethan theatre-going crowd, since they dealt with subject-matter that, because of its national and spectacular qualities, could not fail to appeal to the mob, only two plays of this type remain to us that can with any degree of certainty be ascribed to Thomas Heywood.

The earlier of these, "Edward IV," First and Second Parts, was entered in the Stationers' Register on August 28, 1599, and published anonymously in the year 1600.¹ The title-page, which states that the play "hath been divers times publikely played by the Right Honorable the Earle of Derby his servants," gives according to Aronstein² the best clue to the date of this double drama, for it would seem to indicate that the play was written by Heywood for Lord Derby's Company.³ We know, he argues that Heywood was with the Lord Admiral's Company till February, 1599, and that then he disappears "from 'Henslowe's Diary'" till September,

¹ With but one dissentient voice the drama is ascribed by critics to Heywood. Fleay, although he agrees that "Edward IV" was written in the years 1598-99, is not willing to grant authorship of it to Heywood, on the ground mainly that the two parts of the play "are far better than his other early work" ("Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama," 1599-1642, Vol. I, pp. 288-99). By a very ingenious process of reasoning he comes to the conclusion that Chettle and Day, mentioned by Henslowe (Jan., 1602; May, 1603) as having rewritten for the Earle of Worcester's Players the story of Jane Shore, were also authors of "Edward IV." Heywood, it is true, never published this play himself as he did his other dramas, but Fleay's arguments are nevertheless unconvincing. There seems to be no valid reason for doubting that Heywood wrote "Edward IV." The style is undeniably his; the subject matter and handling point more clearly to him than to any of his contemporaries. The whole story of Shore and his wife is treated with a kindliness and sympathy that was characteristic of the author of "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse." As Aronstein ("Anglia Zeitschrift" 37, p. 205) remarks, "The plays bear throughout the stamp of his art and especially his mode of thought."

² "Anglia Zeitschrift fur. Eng. Philologie," 37, p. 204.

³ J. Tucker Murray, "English Dramatic Companies," Vol. II, p. 141.

1602.¹ This suggests to Aronstein a possible disagreement between Henslowe and the young actor which resulted in Heywood leaving the Admiral's Men, and binding himself to, or at least writing for, Lord Derby's Troop, which played for the most part in the provinces but from time to time in London.² Thus the play may have been composed some time between February 1599 and the date of its entry in the Stationers' Register in August of the same year.

The two parts of the drama handle a large variety of themes suggesting an equally large variety of sources; and chronicle histories, ballads, and dramatic works can be cited as origins and analogues. An older play, "The Siege of London,"³ mentioned by Henslowe on December 26, 1594, and played twelve times between that date and September 6, 1596, apparently dealt with the same matter as the early section of Part One, "the besieging of London, by the Bastard Falconbridge," and may possibly, though this is mere surmise, have been by the same author.⁴

The principal source, however, is to be found in "Holinshed's Chronicle," which includes Sir Thomas More's "Life of Richard III." From this is derived practically all the material for the play with the solitary exception of the story of Edward's adventures with the jolly Tanner of Tamworth, which has been traced to a contemporary ballad.⁵ The dramatist may have been indebted for his historical matter, too, to Hardyng and to

¹ *Vide* Biography in Thesis.

² J. Tucker Murray, "English Dramatic Companies," Vol. I, p. 292-93, and Vol. II, p. 141. Heywood was bound by his contract of 1598-1600 to act for the Admiral's Men. There is no reason to believe with Aronstein that he broke his contract; for the terms of his contract did not prevent his writing for the Earl of Derby's Men. The fact that from February, 1599 to September, 1602 he is not mentioned in "Henslowe's Diary" is, however, significant, as if he had still been writing for the Admiral's Men during that time, Henslowe would certainly have recorded it. No satisfactory explanation of this enigma has yet been offered by critics.

³ "Henslowe," p. 46.

⁴ Greg, "Henslowe's Diary." Part II, p. 173, does not regard the parts of "Edward IV" which deal with the siege of London as a reprint of the earlier play, and says, "whatever was taken from the earlier work must have been practically re-written," since there are "no signs of botching." He regards "Edward IV" as "unquestionably Heywood's."

⁵ Percy, "Reliques," Ser. II, 15.

57544

Halle, whose accounts are very similar to those of Holinshed and also include More's "Richard III," in modified form.

Heywood, we can be sure, was acquainted with the work of all the chroniclers, and probably used them fairly indiscriminately.

The Jane Shore story, which is to be found in More's "Richard III," and which is really the theme of chief interest to the dramatist, seems to have been very popular at the time. The love affairs of kings are always interesting to the vulgar, and the pitiful stories of Rosamund and of Jane Shore seem to have had a particular charm. At any rate, Percy prints a ballad from an old black-letter copy in the Pepys collection, the full title of which is "The woeful lamentation of Jane Shore, a goldsmith's wife in London, sometime King Edward IV, his concubine. To the tune of 'Live with me,' etc." Percy does not endeavour to date this ballad, and it may possibly have been written after Heywood's play, but that a poem about Jane Shore did precede "Edward IV" is an unquestionable fact. In the 1563 edition of "The Mirour for Magistrates" appears a poem by Th. Churchyard,¹ entitled "How Shore's Wife, King Edward the Fourth's Concubine, was by King Richard despoiled of all her goods and forced to do open penance." In Churchyard's "Challenge," in which the poem is reprinted with some additions, we find the statement made by the poet that it was written in the reign of Edward VI, 1547-53, thus long before Heywood's "Edward IV." A dull moralizing poem of 77 seven-line stanzas, Churchyard's "Jane Shore" is, in detail, less close to Heywood's play than the ballad printed by Percy. In this connection it is worth while noting that the name of Jane's false friend, Dame Blague, neither appears in the chronicle history sources nor in Churchyard's poem, but is to be found in the Percy ballad and Heywood's "Edward IV" alone. In Nicholas Rowe's play of "Jane Shore" (1714), obviously based on Heywood, Dame Blague becomes Alicia, Jane's best friend and, at the same time, her jealous rival since she believes Jane has stolen Hastings, her lover, from her. The correspondence between the ballad and Heywood's play, in

¹ "Mirour for Magistrates" (Haslewood Ed., 1815), 461.

this apparently minor detail, is, as it seems to me, significant, since it indicates a pretty close connection between the two.¹

Although Holinshed can be taken to be the primary source of the historical subject-matter, it is important to note that Heywood might very easily have obtained suggestions as to theme and staging from contemporary plays on English historical subjects. Shakespeare's "Henry VI" (2 and 3) and "Richard III," "Jack Straw," "The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York," "Edward III," "The True Tragedie of Richard III," and "Sir Thomas Moore,"² have all been suggested as analogues. Of these, "Jack Strawe" and "Sir Thomas Moore" (1592-3) are similar only in their presentation of popular disturbances; "The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York" (1595), in that it deals with the Wars of the Roses; "Henry VI," in its account of a peasant revolt under Cade and its description of the rise of Edward IV; and "Edward III," in that it gives us the story of a royal passion, that of the king for the virtuous Countess of Salisbury. We draw closer to Heywood's play, however, in "Richard III" (1593) and "The True Tragedie of Richard III" (1594), which Heywood must certainly have read and had in mind when he wrote the second part of "Edward IV."³

In Shakespeare's "Richard III," as in "Edward IV," are to be found accounts of the death of Clarence, of the death of King Edward, and of the murder of the princes in the Tower. In "Richard III," however, the entire emphasis has been placed on the tyrant king, and thus the play includes many episodes, which Heywood, partly to avoid repetition of the earlier work, partly because they were unrelated to the themes in which he was throughout most interested, and partly to keep his play within reasonable bounds of length, has entirely

¹ To the list of English poems of the time based on the Jane Shore story may be added that by Michael Drayton in his "Heroical Epistles" (1597), an uninspired piece of verse with little poetical merit, which gives no indication whatsoever of having provided Heywood with any of his material.

² Entered on its title-page as "The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore."

³ Material derived from More's account of the indictment of Hastings and the punishment of Jane Shore by Richard III is to be found also in Legge's Latin play, "Ricardus Tertius" (1579). Here Jane is presented in a dumb show at the end of Act I, "in her petticoate, havinge a taper burninge in her hand." *Vide* Hazlitt, "Shakespeare's Library."

omitted. Thus, while Shakespeare carries his narrative through to Bosworth Field, and the victory of Henry Tudor, Heywood brings his to an abrupt conclusion with the death of the two Shores, Jane and her husband.

"The True Tragedie of Richard III; wherein is showne the death of Edward IV, with the smothering of the two young princes in the Tower; with a lamentable ende of Shore's wife, an example for all wicked women, and lastly the conjunction and joyning of the two noble Houses, Lancaster and York." The very title-page of this play shows the lines along which it resembles "Edward IV," but here again Heywood has been careful not to repeat scenes already familiar to his audience, or if he does so, to develop them along new lines of interest. The play opens with the death of Edward IV, and gives a detailed account of the intrigues by means of which the young princes were separated from their mother and their friends. The fall of Hastings, which in Shakespeare's "Richard III" forms the basis of several scenes, and to which Heywood pays absolutely no attention, perhaps fearing that any suggestion of a connection between Jane and the noble lord might detract from the character of deep repentance for her sin with which he has endowed her, plays an important part in this drama. The treatment of the murder scene in the Tower is more concise and rapid, but less full of pathos than Heywood's handling of the same historical event. The Jane Shore story ends, as in the chronicle history sources, with Jane's disgrace and poverty, and neither contains the final reconciliation with which "Edward IV" closes, nor is worked out with the detail and vividness of Heywood's rendering.

In short, the dramatic works which preceded "Edward IV," and which dealt with the same similar historical events must, it seems to me, be regarded as analogues rather than origins, though "The True Tragedie of Richard III," in some of its Jane Shore scenes, does bear a very marked resemblance to the later play. That Heywood was quite familiar with the earlier plays appears certain, so careful is he to present things in a novel way.

Of the variety of incidents that Heywood has dramatized in "Edward IV," the least interesting to him were certainly those that were more purely historical. Part I

opens with a brief scene in which the queen mother chides Edward for his hasty marriage to Lady Elizabeth Gray. She suggests to her son that his action will arouse Warwick's anger, and, naturally enough, we expect some account of Tewkesbury and of Barnet. But, instead, we are given the revolt of "the malcontented commons" under Falconbridge. Against Falconbridge and his fellow rebels the good citizens of London, under Mayor Crosby and the aldermen, offer a most valiant resistance. We feel throughout that Heywood is not interested so much in depicting scenes of battle as in glorifying the deeds of his own theatrical constituency, the prentices of the city. We can easily imagine how the scene in which the mayor harangues the citizens,

"Then show yourselves as it befits the time,
And let this find a hundred Walworth's now
Dare stab a rebel, were he made of brass
And, prentices, stick to your officers
For you may come to be as we are now,
God and our King against the rebel!
Brothers, away, let us defend our walls" . . . ¹

would be cheered to the echo. The contrast, too, between the cowardly troops under Falconbridge and the resolute prentice army is one which would not fail to elicit loud applause in a theatre packed with citizens proud of their city's history. Thus we have in Heywood's treatment of the rebellion of Falconbridge a dramatization of chronicle history,² but a dramatization in which the historical itself occupies a position of decidedly minor importance. The later development of the play, indeed, would lead us to believe that Heywood's main object in inserting these scenes, aside from his desire to tickle the palate of his bourgeois audience, was to present to us the high-minded and brave citizen, Matthew Shore; to show how gallantly he fought for his king; and to make the sin of that king with his wife all the greater in that it showed him guilty not merely of adultery but of the basest treachery and ingratitude.

There are no more scenes that can be regarded as purely historical in Part I of "Edward IV." The rest of this part

¹ "Edward IV" (Pearson Ed., 1876, Vol. I), Part I, p. 17.

² Holinshed, III, 321.

is concerned entirely with the stories of Hobs the tanner and of Jane and Matthew Shore. Let us turn then to Part II, which contains very much more historical matter. The treatment of Edward's war with France, which occupies the early scenes of this second section of the drama is, on the whole, dull and uninspired. There is plenty of opportunity afforded by it for magnificence of stage-setting or of costumes, and perhaps this is the chief reason for its existence. The citizen crowd must surely have demanded spectacular and warlike scenes in history plays, and Heywood, writer for the bourgeoisie that he was, probably wrote this portion of his play to satisfy that demand. Occasionally the patriotic note is struck. We have references to Henry V and the great Bedford; the terms which Edward offers Lewis are such as to portray England as triumphant conqueror. How the pit must have shouted their approval!

But these scenes, as has been remarked before, lack real vitality. Heywood is not particularly interested in them. They have no connection with the rest of the play, save the fact that Edward appears in them, and seem more like padding them than anything else, a mere episode in a series of badly-linked historical episodes.

A short chorus relating Edward's return to England concludes them and introduces us once more to the really important persons in Part II of the play, Jane Shore and her husband. For a while we are concerned almost entirely with their story and history proper is forgotten. Then, in rapid succession, come historical events with which, however, the Shores are more closely connected than heretofore. Clarence is murdered, Edward dies, and Richard compasses the death of the two princes in the Tower. There is more cohesion in the narrative of the historical episodes now, perhaps the fact that Heywood had the earlier plays of "Richard III" as models is responsible.

Without question, the most forceful and vivid historical scene in the play is that when the princes, prior to their murder, lie down to rest with strange misgivings in their hearts. Here is a scene that, because of its pathos, appealed to the tender-hearted and sentimental Heywood. As a result he has given us a very pretty and moving picture of the elder brother comforting and caring for his younger brother:

"*Ric.* How does your lordship ?

Ed. Well, good brother Richard,
How does yourself ? You told me your head aaked.

Ric. Indeed it does, my lord feele with your hands
How hot it is. (*He laies his hand on his brother's head.*)

Ed. Indeed you have caught cold,
With sitting yesternight to heare me read.
I praye thee go to bed, sweet Dick, poore little heart.

Ric. You'le give me leave to wait upon your lordship.

Ed. I had more need, brother, to wait on you
For you are sick ; and so am not I.

Ric. Oh, lord, methinks this going to our bed,
How like it is to going to our grave.

Ed. I pray thee, do not speake of graves, sweet heart.
Indeed thou frightest me.

Ric. Why, my lord brother, did not our tutor teach us,
That when at night we went unto our bed,
We still should think we went unto our grave ?

Ed. Yes, that's true,
That we should do as ev'ry Christian ought,
To be prepar'd to die at every hour,
But I am heavy.

Ric. Indeed and so am I.

Ed. Then let us say our prayers and go to bed."¹

Nowhere else in the two parts of "Edward IV," however, do the purely historical scenes rise to the simple pathos and realism of the foregoing, for this touching picture of childhood is one well-suited to Heywood's sentimental mind. In the main, the history in these plays after all is subordinate in interest, and appears only in skeleton form. It is the background for a drama of city life, the Jane Shore story, and for the comic ballad narrative of Edward and his tanner-acquaintance, Hobs.

The latter is the theme of lesser importance. It is entirely comprised within Part I of the play, whereas the other tale runs through both parts. It is comic, a humorous sop for the populace, while the other is domestic tragedy of a most pathetic kind. We will do well, therefore, to consider it first, leaving the more vital theme, the real flesh and blood of the play to be considered later.

¹ "Edward IV," Part II (Pearson Ed., Vol. I), pp. 153-54.

The story of Hobs, the Tanner of Tamworth, has been derived, as has been indicated already, from an old ballad to be found in Bishop Percy's "Reliques." Percy obtained his version from a text in the Bodleian Library,¹ printed in 1596, which, he suggests, seems to have been modernized and altered at the time it was published. He has, therefore, amalgamated with this text another copy of the poem in the Pepys Collection, choosing from the latter what appear to be the more ancient readings. In addition, he refers to a still more ancient ballad, that of "The King and the Barker," to be found in Ritson's "Pieces of Ancient Popular Poetry from Authentic MSS. and Printed Copies" (1791), which Ritson insists is "the undoubted original" of Percy's reprint.

The tale, it is clear, was very familiar to Elizabethan audiences. It was the theme of popular ballads, and from a popular ballad was taken over to give spice to a popular drama by Heywood. Edward IV was primarily the favourite son, if we dare call a king such, of the London bourgeoisie. He owed his victories over the forces of the Lancastrians very largely to the loyalty and valour of citizen troops. What more natural than that Heywood should endeavour to depict him as a jovial and democratic monarch, one who mingled freely with his people and acted towards them with a bluff generosity that even the most humble could understand and appreciate?

Hence we have the tanner incident in Part I of "Edward IV." The comic elements in the situation have a distinct charm. The tanner does not recognize the king and he speaks to him with startling frankness. He refuses to discuss the rival claims of York and Lancaster, but he does not hesitate to condemn the practice of granting letters patent and the abuses that arise therefrom, thereby attacking an evil existent in Heywood's own time. When the king asks his name, he remarks with some surprise, "Dost thou not know me?" "No," replies the king. "Then thou knowest nobody," declares Hobs, with conviction.

In short, the whole story of his meeting with the king in

¹ Percy Series II, 15. "A merrie pleasant and delectable historie between King Edward the Fourth and a tanner of Tamworth—printed by John Danter, 1596." It is interesting to note that this section of the play was edited and acted as a separate play under the title, "The King in the Country," in 1788.

the woods, of the dinner he provided for the king at his humble house, and of his visit to court and final recognition of the king as such, is told in a delightful manner, and presents us with a most vivid picture of the countryman and country life. It has nothing to do with the rest of the play, but the play after all is a hotchpotch. To the groundlings Hobs must have been a glorious source of delight. For them Heywood, the playwright for the bourgeoisie, created him.

But the sections of the play which dwarf all others into insignificance, are those which deal with Jane Shore. The popularity of this story has already been emphasized, and it is scarcely necessary to show in what details Heywood follows the accounts of Sir Thomas More and his successors. It is more profitable to note wherein he has further developed or, in any way, modified the story. By so doing we can draw closer to an understanding of his dramatic method.

In the first place it is worth while remarking that in Heywood and Rowe alone do we find any mention of a reconciliation between Jane and her injured husband. Rowe, of course, followed Heywood in this, so that we may say, unless evidence be brought to light to the contrary, that the idea of a reconciliation originated with Heywood. Heywood's wronged husbands, we shall find in our study of other of his plays, always do forgive, his erring wives always repent.

Heywood's Jane is not the Jane of Sir Thomas More. Sir Thomas More describes her as a girl who had married young, not of her own will, but forced by the authority of her parents. Naturally enough she was an easy victim for the handsome young king. In Heywood, however, she first appears as the loving wife. She vows no one will ever make her untrue to Shore, her goldsmith husband. And then the king enters her life. He meets her at a banquet which Mayor Crosby has prepared for him, and is at once overcome by her beauty. In a wonderfully realistic scene in the goldsmith's shop he pays court to her in disguise, finally revealing his identity to her. Shore enters as he is about to leave and recognizes the king, but Jane Shore endeavours to deceive her husband by assuring him that it could not possibly be Edward. However, she has not yet yielded to temptation, and only falls after having taken advice of the self-seeking Dame Blague, who persuades her

that the king can advance her, if only she will consent to be his mistress. The difference between this and More's account of her is obvious. In one she gives in readily, in the other she is temporarily dazzled, and, for the time forgetting her real love for Shore, succumbs to the desire for station and riches.

In the play, as in the chronicles, Shore leaves her at once on learning of her faithlessness; but in the play he does more, he departs from England. Like the Jane Shore of Sir Thomas More's narrative, Jane now a king's favourite, wins the hearts of all by her deeds of charity. Heywood represents her as conscious of her guilt, and striving as best she can, to make amends; he even brings about a meeting between her and Shore before he actually leaves England, a meeting at which she begs forgiveness and to be re-instated as his wife, but is repulsed.

In Part II of the play, after the tedious historical scenes of the war with France, her story is continued and occupies the major portion of the rest of the play. From now on it is Heywood's own invention, except for one scene, that of Jane's punishment by Richard III. With Captain Strangwidge, who has unwittingly broken the truce with France by capturing a French ship, is Matthew Shore, imprisoned in the Marshalsea under sentence of death. Jane still continuing her course of charity visits the prison, and is induced by Sir Robert Brackenbury to plead for them with the king. Shore is disguised and is not recognized by his wife, though he recognizes her. Jane, arrested by Dorset, by command of the queen, is brought before her majesty, and by her demeanour and genuine remorse arouses her pity and sympathy, although at first Queen Elizabeth's attitude towards her is one of hostility. Together they plead for the prisoners, and Shore is saved while on the very steps to the gallows.

At this point in the play Edward dies, and Jane suffers a complete change in fortunes. Heywood, as has been stated before, does not link her name up with Hastings as does More, but he does take from More the account of her punishment by the new king. Of course, Mrs. Blague proves false to her, and refuses her shelter in her house, when the king's proclamation against her is made known to her. But Jackie, her servant, the

inevitable clown of the piece, remains faithful to her, and Shore, who has been stabbed in the arm by Dighton while trying to defend the princes in the Tower, has undergone a complete change of heart, partly through gratitude to her and partly because he cannot bear the sight of her suffering. The friends she has made by her deeds of kindness also bring her aid, and are punished in accordance with the King's orders for so doing. Shore, however, wins his pardon from the King for exposing the traitor, Rufford, and there is a final scene in which he reveals himself to his wife and forgives her all. In her astonishment and joy Jane very properly dies in his arms, and Shore, after kissing her dead lips, follows her example—a piece of sentimentality very characteristic of the most sentimental of Elizabethan dramatists.

Heywood's additions to the Jane Shore story, it can be seen, all tend to intensify its tragic elements. In his hands it has become a powerful drama of citizen life, just melodramatic and sentimental enough to make the strongest of appeals to an uncritical bourgeois audience. His picture of the repentant sinner arouses their sympathy; she becomes almost a creature more sinned against than sinning. Still bourgeois morality demands that sin be punished. So Jane suffers the consequences of her sin, and Heywood is the first to insist that it is only right that she should do so. Where he rises above his contemporaries, except of course Shakespeare, is in his conception of forgiveness. But of this more hereafter.

The two parts of "Edward IV" thus contain three distinct streams of interest: those based on the chronicle history, on the comic ballad of the tanner and the king, and on the sad story of Jane Shore, the King's mistress. The historical matter is disjointed and dull, save in its pictures of citizen life and its praise of citizen valour, but has in it elements of patriotism and of the spectacular that redeemed it with the audience. The tale of Hobs, the tanner, is cleverly told, but at the same time simply thrown into the play as a sort of comic underplot, having no relation to the material into which it is cast save that it deals with Edward the King. In the tragedy of Jane Shore, which undoubtedly interested the dramatist most, lies the real dramatic and poetic value of the play. But would it not have been better for Heywood simply to have condensed this.

material into one unified drama like that of his successor, Rowe?

Why he handled his subject-matter as he did will be clear, I think, on comparison of this play with the second of his chronicle history-plays, and of them both with the early chronicle history-plays as a general type.

The two parts of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie" were entered in the Stationers' Register under the dates July 5, 1605, and September 14 of the same year, and were first printed in the years 1605 and 1606, respectively. That the plays were extremely popular is clear from the fact that editions of Part I appeared subsequently in the years 1606, 1608, 1610, 1618, 1632 and 1680; of Part II in the years 1608, and 1632. The edition authorized by the dramatist himself was that of 1632, the previous editions, as he intimates in his prologue written for its revival at the Cockpit at an unknown date,¹ being pirated. So popular indeed was it,

"that some by stenography drew
The plot; put it in print; (scarce one word trew;)
And in that lameness it hath limp't so long,
The author now to vindicate that wrong
Hath took the paines, upright upon its feete
To teache it walke, so please you sit, and see't."²

In the "English Chronicle Play" (1902) Schelling³ sets the date of the historical parts of the two dramas as early as 1590, but in his later work, "Elizabethan Drama," is inclined to regard them as plays produced in 1604-5 after the death of the great Elizabeth, and as tributes to her memory.⁴ He is thus enabled to cite them as examples of "the journalistic function of the Elizabethan stage." Aronstein, however, argues for an earlier date on the ground mainly that they seem to him to belong to the dramatist's earliest work. He adds that the years from 1590 onward were remarkable for their intensely patriotic and Protestant enthusiasm—naturally the defeat of the Armada in 1588 would make them so—and concludes by saying that if "an actual so-to-speak journalistic occasion" for their composition be demanded by the critic,

¹ The Prologue was printed by Heywood in "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's" (1637).

² Prologue. ³ Schelling, "The English Chronicle Play," p. 238.

⁴ "Elizabethan Drama," I, p. 288.

the founding of Gresham College in 1596,¹ which would recall to men both the establishment of the Exchange by Gresham in 1571² and the early years of the Queen herself might easily be regarded as such. That the play was not printed till 1605, argues Aronstein, can easily be explained by the fact that, after Elizabeth's death in 1603, plays about her reign and those of her predecessors would tend to become popular anew. Thus we have published within the brief space of three years Bowley's "When You See Me, You Know Me, or the famous Chronicle History of King Henrie the Eight" (1605), Dekker's "Whore of Babylon" (1607),³ and the plays at present under consideration. On the basis of the workmanship of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie," it seems that Aronstein's earlier date is to be preferred. The play may well be of, approximately, the same period of production as "Edward IV."

The two parts of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie" must be regarded separately. The first part is a running narrative of the indignities which Elizabeth suffered at the hands of her sister, Queen Mary.⁴ The play shows a lack of cohesion, not unlike that of "Edward IV." Elizabeth is shown subjected to one injury, then to another, and so the drama rambles on to its conclusion with Mary's death and her sister's accession. It is essentially history dramatized, no more than a series of incidents in the life of the young princess slenderly linked together into a play, the main purpose of which is propaganda. For Protestant propaganda is obviously Heywood's purpose; propaganda and a natural desire to flatter the great Queen, whose fleet had overcome the Armada.

¹ Established in London on a bequest left by Sir Thomas Gresham.

² "The first stone was laid June 7, 1566, and in 1571 the Queen, after dining with Sir Thomas Gresham in Bishopsgate St., erected the newly erected 'Burse' and caused the herald to proclaim it the Royal Exchange, 'so to be called from thenceforth and no otherwise.'" ("Shakespeare's England," Vol. II, p. 176).

³ Fleay ("Biog. Chronicle of the Eng. Drama," p. 292) is of the opinion that Heywood's play was acted in rivalry to Dekker's "Whore of Babylon," as revived by Prince Henry's men about 1604.

⁴ "It is clear at the same time that this portion of the work must at best have been a crude *ad captandum* treatment of Elizabeth's experiences before her accession, following the text-book, Heywood's own monograph, "England's Elizabeth" (Ward, in "The Cambridge History of Eng. Lit.," Vol. VI, pp. 103-4).

The characterization is not particularly good. Elizabeth is represented throughout as a martyr princess oppressed by her Catholic foes, and is endowed with an intense piety that it is more or less difficult to associate with what we have learned of her character. Philip, the Catholic King of England, is treated with surprising tolerance.¹ He appears before us as a kindly prince, just by nature and sympathetic with Elizabeth in her trials. Mary is a queen very much under the control of her advisors, who are the real enemies of the gentle and long-suffering Elizabeth.

Comic relief, of course, is provided by a clown and by several scenes in which soldiers and a cook appear. It is not high comedy, but crude comedy; the comedy unquestionably of the early pre-Marlovian chronicle plays. No comic characters stand out with any real vividness. There is not even a Josselin² with his muddle-headed good intentions, or a Hobs to give to this play the life that these characters give to the comic scenes of "Edward IV." In short, the whole is a very mediocre production.

It has, however, one characteristic that distinguishes it from the conventional chronicle play, that is, its biographical nature. By means of a series of dramatized incidents in the life of the Queen, interspersed with occasional dumb shows, which help out the action over difficult places, it gives us a story not of the nation, but of a particular person; the story not of the effects of Mary's rule on the country at large, but simply on an individual.

The second part of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie," is also biographical and deals, as the title page suggests, with the life of Sir Thomas Gresham and his building of the Royal Exchange, and to a less degree with the victory over the Armada in 1588.³ The section on the Armada is pure

¹ It is worth while contrasting Heywood's tolerance with the vigorous detraction of famous characters in other works of the time, for example, Joan of Arc in "Henry VI," and Elinor of Castile in ballads and in Peele's "Edward I."

² One of the citizen characters in "Edward IV," Part I.

³ This section on the Armada, which appears in two versions in the editions of 1606 and of 1632, is considered very carefully by Van Dam and Stoffel in their treatise, "The Fifth Act of Thomas Heywood's 'Queen Elizabeth,' Second Part" (Shakespeare, Jahrbuch, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 153-195). An attempt is made to ascertain which version is the more authentic.

patriotic clap-trap. It gives a pretty good account of the state of England at the time of the threatened invasion, and of the battle at sea which forestalled that invasion, but has no connection whatsoever with the rest of the play, which is in the main a comedy of commercial life in London.

A play with which it may well be considered is the later "*Byrsa Basilica seu Regale Excambium a Sereniss*," by J. Rickets, printed in 1570, which was written in honour of Sir Thomas Gresham, and in which the knight himself appears in the person of Rialto. This is a very complicated comedy of intrigue, in which all manner of citizen characters take part, but, aside from its connection with Gresham, bears little resemblance to Heywood's play. It is interesting, however, as a sample of like comedy of bourgeois life, and is at least an analogue to the play.

The comic element in Part II of "*If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie*," is provided largely by the escapades of the younger Gresham, a rake and ne'er-do-well, blessed with nimble wit, with which he tricks his uncle and old Hobson, whose factor he is. Hobson, who, like Hobs in "*Edward IV*," is surprised that royalty should not know him,¹ contributed much to the humour of the piece. Like Josselin in "*Edward IV*," who is always using the words "and so forth," Hobson has a characteristic phrase, "Bones a me," which must have been highly amusing to the vulgar crowd in the theatre. Still he is by no means a purely ludicrous figure. He is shrewd, capable, generous, kind-hearted, a plain-spoken bourgeois hero in his own way. Proud of his station in life, he has no use for the genteel airs and fine raiment of the younger Gresham, and insists that if he is to enter his service he must array himself more in keeping with his vocation,

"But gentleman if you become my man,
You must become more civill; bones a me,
What a curld pate is here? I must ha't off
You see my livery: Hobson's men are knowne
By their freeze coats. And you will dwell with me
You must be plaine, and leave off bravery."²

¹ "Knewest thou not me, Queen? Then thou knowest nobody. Bones a me, Queene, I am Hobson, and old Hobson. By the Socks, I am sure, you know me" (Pearson Ed., p. 317).

² Pearson Ed., p. 260.

Thrift and good business sense have made him wealthy, and universally esteemed, and Hobson, despite his sober cloth and unpolished speech, is one of whom the city merchant class might well be proud. His generosity toward the pedlar, Tawnycoat, and his loyalty towards his old friends make him very human and very lovable. The words he uses to Gresham and Ramsey, when he is trying to bring about a reconciliation between the two men, reveal not only his goodheartedness, but the canny merchant strain that has made him so prosperous.

“Bones a me, Ile hold you fast,
I will not have a couple of such men
Make cackling lawyers rich, and themselves fools
And for a trifling cause, as I am old Hobson.”¹

It seems rather a pity that such a worthy old man should be so duped by the unscrupulous young factor at the end of the play, but without that Heywood would not have had his comedy.

Omitting discussion of the minor comic figures, such as Timothy, the Puritan, and the impudent French courtesan, who outfaces old Hobson, let us turn to the more serious element in the play. This is to be found in the picture of another London merchant, the elder Gresham, founder of the Exchange. Sir Thomas is a far bigger man than honest Hobson, a citizen of whom the bourgeoisie might well be proud. His wealth is fabulous. When the Russian ambassador refuses to buy a pearl because it is too dear, Gresham, though he has met with severe business losses in Barbary, purchases it, to pound up and throw into the glass from which he is drinking the Queen's health. His riches entitle him to comparison with lords and with princes, and he can mingle apparently with the finest society without embarrassment. He is the merchant prince *par excellence*, the hero of the play.

He is generous and public-spirited, and determined to put his fortune to good use. To this he is inspired by the example of the great London merchants of the past: Philpot, Walworth, Whittington, Allen and Laxton, whose deeds are fittingly recorded in one of the scenes of the play.² His greatest public work, of course, is the founding of the Royal Exchange, and we are given, scene by scene, its whole story. Gresham, caught in a rain-storm, gets the idea of a great hall where

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

² Pearson Edition, pp. 276-78.

merchants can congregate for business at all times and in all weathers; he gets permission from the Crown to build; he himself supervises the building, which finally is opened by the Queen, and stands as one of the wonders of London city. Surely the presentation of such a character, and the relation of the foundation of so famous a building, assured the popularity of the play. For, after all, there is little else to recommend it.

Study of the early English chronicle play, that is the chronicle play as it existed before Marlowe and Shakespeare took hold of it, will reveal to us, I believe, that in Thomas Heywood's dramatizations of English history we have a marked reversion to the older forms of this genre.

The most noticeable trait of the early chronicle play was that it was of an episodic nature, disjointed and rambling; with a central figure, it is true, but no central and unifying action. Based on the chronicle histories, it moved from incident to incident much as they did, presenting first one then another in chronological sequence, and caring not at all whether any causal connection existed between them. As a result, the dramas evolved were wanting in true dramatic structure, patchwork productions in which the patches were only too clumsily sewn together. However, since they retold national history to an audience that no amount of history seemed to satiate, their lack of construction did not detract from their popularity. In fact, this loose structure was a legacy from the early miracle plays and directly in the old mediæval dramatic tradition. In the miracles Biblical narrative was put on to the stage in just this manner. Each guild was responsible for a single Bible incident, and staged it paying no heed to its relation to the other incidents that composed the cycle. Thus the miracle plays consisted of a series of episodes, chronologically arranged, but lacking any fundamental unity, as were those in the early chronicle histories, which derived their method from them. There is, of course, more coherence in Heywood's English history plays, but there can be, I think, no doubt whatsoever, as to their ultimate ancestry.

In contrast with plays of this sort the advance in art in Marlowe's "Edward II" and the historical plays of Shakespeare is obvious. The history plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare are based, like those of their predecessors, on the

narratives of the chroniclers, but they are no longer episodic. Event leads on to event, and incident springs from incident, from start to conclusion of the dramatic story. The fortunes of the central figure form the whole theme, and the causal relation between the steps in his rise or fall is always impressed upon us. The dramatist is no longer slavishly dramatizing a chronicle history, but he is showing us merely the things that count, the actions of an historic personage that influence his fortune, and the direct results of those actions. In neither "Edward IV" nor "If You Know Not Me, You Know No Bodie," can this be said to be the case. They have been shown already to be episodic in construction; the technique is that of the early chronicles.

But the old joy in the chronicle play had, in Heywood's day, of course, undergone some change. People were no longer content with the mere presentation of endless battles and gaily dressed kings and nobles on the stage, for they had acquired a taste for something more than mere pageantry, for scenes of love-interest and of emotional power. Though the national spirit was still very much alive, and the bourgeoisie still felt the thrill of national pride at England's triumphs over Spain, and delighted in the noise of battle and the narration of warlike deeds and brave adventures, they wanted something more. Hence we find Heywood giving us in "Edward IV" and "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie" plays, which, though retaining the old chronicle form, infused into that form much that was new and in accord with the change in interests of his day; a new wine in the old bottles.

For the plays, though they are like the earlier dramas in so much, in their technique, their nationalistic and partisan spirit—the Protestant propaganda of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie" is a flagrant instance of this—and in their blending of the serious and historical with coarse comedy to delight the vulgar, strike a new note in their portrayal of city life and merchant characters. There is a civic pride in the realistic pictures of tradesmen and city officers; in the diligence of the prentices bustling round Shore's shop or Hobson's warehouse, and their valour in the defence of their loved London; in the turmoil and traffic of the great Royal Exchange, founded by a middle-class Londoner for middle-class Londoners.

And with this realism and this civic pride, Heywood has in "Edward IV" given his audience something more; he has given it domestic tragedy in the story of Jane Shore, a tragedy not of the high-born or the noble, but tragedy drawn from bourgeois life. True a king is the cause of it all, but the interest centres not on the king but on his victims. The sentimentality and the tone of middle-class morality in Heywood's treatment of the theme have already been pointed out.

We have thus, in Heywood's English history plays, four plays containing a great variety of disconnected matter, but matter which, in every instance, is chosen specifically with a citizen "house" in mind. He has satisfied at once a taste for history, national and civic pride, religious prejudices, love of rough comedy and of the ballad style of story, and a fondness for the pathetic, the sentimental and the moralizing. Dramatically, he has perhaps been most successful in the last named.

THOMAS HEYWOOD'S DRAMATIZATIONS OF CLASSICAL THEMES

Thomas Heywood, Fellow of Peterhouse, translator of Sallust, Ovid and Lucian, author of the learned "Hierarchie," "Apology for Actors," "Gunaikeion," etc., was a lover of Latin and Greek all his life.¹ Though he left Cambridge apparently without a degree, we have every reason to believe that his knowledge of classic authors was extensive and first-hand. Evidence of this is to be found in his style, full of unusual and learned words derived from classical roots, and in his frequent quotations from, and references to, classic authors. Obviously, he had all the scholar's love of airing his learning.

In no two works by him is this, perhaps, more evident than in "The Apology for Actors," already cited, and in that series of educational semi-dramatic dialogues entitled "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's." The former contains long lists of authors, especially dramatists, famous in antiquity; retails much legendary and historical matter gleaned from classical poets and historians and abounds in actual quotations from Horace, Ovid, Vitruvius, Xiphilinus and others, late or early, who wrote in Greek or Latin. His reading, judged on the basis of this treatise merely, seems to have been very extensive, and there appears to be every reason to believe that whenever possible he went back to the actual works of the classic authors themselves.

The "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's," which I cannot consider as ever intended for actual dramatization, further increase our respect for his learning.² "Selected," as the title-page informs us, "out of Lucian, Erasmus, Textor,

¹ Rupert Brooke, "John Webster and the Elizabethan Drama," p. 200.

² Fleay endeavours to identify five of these "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's" with "Five Plays in One," acted at the Rose, April 17, 1597; on the ground that they are "just enough to make up an afternoon's performance." The dramas selected are: (a) "Deorum Judicium," a dialogue ("The judgment of Paris"), 14 pp.; (b) "Jupiter and Io," a drama, 22 pp.; (c) "Apollo and Daphne," a drama, 15 pp.; (d) "Pelopaea and Alope, or Amphrissa," or "Cupid and Psyche," the original form of "Love's Mistress" without the clown; (e) "Misanthropos." The whole would make about 100 pp. for the five.

Ovid, etc.," their object is plainly to impart instruction in delectable ways. "Playes," says Heywood, in his "Apology for Actors,"¹ "have made the ignorant more apprehensive, taught the unlearned the knowledge of many famous histories; instructed such as cannot reade in the discovery of all our English Chronicles"; and it is because plays have proved so efficacious in the dissemination of learning that this series of snatches from classical literature has been put into semi-dramatic form. The dialogues and dramas, it is to be noted, are for the most part paraphrases, "which," as the poet confesses of the dialogues in his preface to the generous reader, "though I have met with in Prose onely, yet upon better acquaintance, I have taught to goe upon even feet and number."

Published in 1637, it is difficult to estimate just when the various parts of this series were composed. But that they were late productions of his genius has been proved by Bang in the introduction to his edition of the series in which he dates them from 1632 to 1636.² Heywood when he wrote them was nearing the end of his long career, and had turned his attention from the stage to the press, which with the rise of a large reading public had begun to acquire an importance equal, if not

Of these, it seems to me, the "Misanthropos" has absolutely no dramatic value and gives no evidence of having been written for stage purposes. "Deorum Judicium," in which the goddesses divest themselves of their raiment before Paris is hardly suitable for the stage. "Jupiter and Io," though it has more dramatic value, is not a stage-play so much as the mere narration of a story. "Apollo and Daphne," which like "Jupiter and Io" has its source in Ovid, might, perhaps, serve as a rather poor drama of the masque type. "Pelopaea and Alope" is a yet more graceful little production of the same type, but shows little or no dramatic power. The five pieces in question appear to have been written with the reader, and not the audience at a theatre, in view. Bang, in the Preface to his Edition of "Pleas. Dial. and Dram." (1903), vigorously criticizes Fleay's theory. Greg, however, seems to accept it, but a comparison of these pieces with Heywood's treatment of like matter in the "Ages" will, I believe, reveal how differently the dramatist handled classical matter when he was dramatizing it. There is a vulgar realism and vigour about the episodes in the "Ages" which is entirely lacking in the "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's."

¹ "Apology for Actors," Part III, p. 52 (Shakespeare Society Reprint, Ed. by J. P. Collier).

² Thomas Heywood, "Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's," Ed. Willy Bang, "Materialien zu Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas," Vol. III (Louvain, 1903).

already superior to, that of the theatre. Hence the "Dialogues and Dramma's," interesting as they are, do not fall within the sphere of my work, which is to confine itself rigidly to Heywood's actual stage productions, and their bourgeois appeal. But they do deserve notice in this, that they reveal two characteristic traits of the poet—his desire to instruct and his wish to popularize classical mythology.

Heywood chose as his distinctive motto the Latin words, "Aut prodesse solent aut delectare," and it is the manifest intention of his mythological "age" series to fulfil both functions:

"Since moderne authors, moderne things have trac't
Serching our chronicles from end to end,
And all knowne histories have long bene grac't
Bootlesse it were in them our time to spend
To iterate tales often times told ore,
Or subjects handled by each common pen;
In which even they that can but read (no more)
Can poynt before we speak, how, where, and when
We have no purpose: Homer old and blinde,
Of old by the best judgements tearm'd divine,
That in his former labours found you kinde,
Is come *the ruder censures to refine;*
And to unlocke the caskel long time shut
Of which none but the learned keepe the key.
Where the rich jewell (poesie) was put,
She that first search't the heavens, Earth, Ayre, and Sea:
We therefore begge, that since so many eyes,
And several judging wits must taste our stile,
The learned will grace, the ruder not despise;
Since what we do, we for their use compile."¹

The epilogue to the Brazen Age reveals the same purpose:

"He that expects five short acts can containe
Each circumstance of these things we present,
Methinkes should shew more barrennesse than braine;
All we have done we aime at your content,
Striving to illustrate things not knowne to all,
In which the learned can onely censure right;
The rest we crave whom we unlettered call,
Rather to attend than judge; for more than sight
We seeke to please. . . ."²

¹ "Silver Age" (Pearson Ed., Vol III), Act I, Sc. i, Prologue, pp. 85-86.

² "Brazen Age" (Pearson Ed., Vol. III), Epilogue, pp. 255-56.

The dramatist's words "to the Reader" at the beginning of Part I of "The Iron Age,"¹ besides commenting on the immense popularity of the three earlier "Ages," re-states the aims of the author in re-telling ancient history—for myth was almost such to him—while the remarks "To the Reader" at the Introduction of Part II of the same Age are even more explicit. "I purpose," writes the author, "(*Deo Assistante*) to illustrate the whole Worke, with an Explanation of all the difficulties, and an Historical Comment of every hard name, which may appeare obscure or intricate to such as are not frequent in poetry. . ."² The explanation and historical comment very probably would be of the same nature as the explanations and comments which one finds in "The Pleasant Dialogues and Damma's," a brief note describing some of the mythological figures of whom his readers might be expected to know but little. Heywood's classical learning, unquestionably, tended to make something of a schoolmaster out of him.

He was not, of course, the only English dramatist to make use of classical themes. Lyly, Peele, Marlowe and Nash had all written myth-plays for boys' companies; Dekker, Chettle, Rowley, and, the greatest of them all, Shakespeare, had gone back to Greek or Roman history and legend for subject-matter for dramas to be presented by their own companies; but Heywood alone wrote specifically to gratify and educate the bourgeoisie. His object was to popularize the classical tradition, with which his own studies had made him so familiar; and his method, as exemplified in the four "Ages" and in "The Rape of Lucrece," is pretty nearly of its own kind in Elizabethan drama.

Though the exact dates of the five parts of Heywood's great mythological cycle are still uncertain and the bone of much critical contention, it is pretty generally agreed that they were all written at an earlier period in his life as a dramatist. Fleay, identifying "The Golden Age" with "Selio and Olimpo" ("Coelo et Olympo") mentioned by Henslowe as acted at The Rose, March, 1595; "The Silver" and "Brazen Ages" as the play "Hercules" acted at The Rose,

¹ "Iron Age," Part I (Pearson Ed., Vol., III) to the Reader, pp. 263-6.

² "Iron Age," Part II (Pearson, Ed., Vol. III) to the Reader, pp. 351-2.

May, 1595;¹ and the parts of the "Iron Age" with "Troye," a new play, June and July, 1596, sets the date of composition of the four "Ages" accordingly. Both Aronstein and Tatlock warn us, however, that Fleay's identifications "must be deemed very uncertain," Aronstein² regarding those of the "Golden" and "Iron Ages" as entirely out of the question.

Aronstein, in fact, on the basis of internal criticism largely, is inclined to believe that the two parts of "The Iron Age," were composed much later than the trilogy of the earlier ages. Certainly there is distinct cleavage between the trilogy and "The Iron Age," as both Aronstein and Tatlock³ note; the "Golden," "Silver" and "Brazen" Ages are parts of one whole, no less than are the two parts of "The Iron Age." The foreword to "The Golden Age," published 1610-11, informs us that it is "the eldest brother of *three* ages, that have adventured the stage," which seems to indicate that "The Iron Age" as yet did not exist. The foreword to "The Silver Age," published 1613, states that it is the writer's purpose "by God's grace, to end with 'Iron'"; so that the Iron Age was at least planned, if not already composed at this time. With these premises, Aronstein goes on to say that inner criticism,⁴ questions of technique and dramatic tone, bear out the probability that that trilogy was written about 1595-96, and the last two dramas possibly some ten or twelve years later.

Tatlock,⁵ however, pays absolutely no attention to Aronstein's theory, and holds that the "Iron Age" was prob-

¹ The two parts of "Hercules" were bought by Henslowe for the Admiral's Men, with three other pieces from Marten Slater or Slaughter, on May 26, 1598, for the sum of £7. Of this play Greg says ("Henslowe's Diary," Part II, p. 175): "There can be little doubt that the two parts of this play are respectively Heywood's 'Silver' and 'Brazen Ages' (printed, without entry, 1613), which between them contain the whole of the story of Hercules." He remarks that Fleay may possibly be right in identifying "Selio and Olimpo" with the "Golden Age," though he hesitates in this instance over the title. Of "Troye," he says that it may be an earlier and shorter version of "The Iron Age," later expanded into the two-part play ("Henslowe's Diary," Part II, p. 180).

² *Anglia*, 37, pp. 217-8.

³ "Mod. Lang. Ass. Publ.," 30, J. S. P. Tatlock, "The Siege of Troy in Eliz. Art, especially in Shakespeare and Heywood," p. 711.

⁴ *Anglia*, 37, p. 217.

⁵ "Mod. Long. Ass. Pub.," 30, p. 708-19.

ably written before the trilogy. He very cleverly fixes the date of "The Iron Age" as after 1593 and before 1607.¹

Identifying it with "Troye," he then sets the date 1594-96 as that of the five plays, ignoring the fact that "The Iron Age" if it were written before 1610 would probably have been mentioned with the other plays in the foreword to "The Golden Age," as it was in the foreword to "The Silver Age" (1613). Indeed Aronstein's theory, in the absence of more conclusive evidence, seems to me more credible, namely, that the success of the trilogy on the stage inspired Heywood to complete his great cycle with two more plays on the same general theme, but certainly not in the same kind. Of the differences in kind, however, more hereafter.

The main source of the "Ages" is to be found in the mediæval "Troy Saga," that is the story of Troy, not as we read it in Homer but as it appears in the mysterious Dictys and Dares, and those who succeeded them as historians of the great war of Greek legend, Benoît de St. Maur, Guido delle Colonne, Joseph of Exeter, Albertus Stadensis, Barbour, Raoul Lefèvre and Lydgate. Raoul Lefèvre's "Recueil des Hystoires Troyennes" (1464), which was based on Guido delle Colonne's "Historia Destructionis Troiae" (1287), was written, as we are told, at the command of Philip the Good, of Burgundy. In 1471 this version of the story was translated by William Caxton, appearing in 1474 as the first English printed book. Heywood's "Troia Britannica, or Great Britain's Troy" (1609), a poem of some 13,000 lines in "ottava rima," has its basis for the most part in this translation of the "Recueil" by Caxton,

¹ Tatlook sees an allusion to Shakespeare's "Richard III" (1592-93) in Part II, p. 369 :

"*Sinon* : A horse, a horse.

"*Pyrrhus* : Ten Kingdoms for a horse to enter Troy."

He then insists that "The Iron Age" antedates "Troia Britannica" (published 1609 and "written about 1604"). He bases this on probable allusion to "The Iron Age" in the following lines :

"And you (great Lord) to whom I dedicate
A second worke, the yssue of my braine
Accept this twin, to that you sawe of late
Sib to the first, and of the self-same straine."

But may this not refer to the plays of the trilogy, which contained matter to be found in Caxton's "Recuyell," of which "Troia Britannica" was a poetic translation?

although it is by no means a slavish translation or reproduction of it. John Lydgate's "Troy Book," derived from Guido delle Colonne and the French original, Benoît, was perhaps the most poetic of the earlier English versions of the Troy story. A revised version of this, a poem of 30,557 lines, "The Life and Death of Hector" (1614), has been ascribed to Heywood, though many critics are inclined to deny him authorship of it. It is quite certain, however, that the four "Ages" owe a very great deal to their primary source, Caxton's "Recuyell," and little or nothing to Lydgate's long poem on the same subject.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the extreme popularity of the Troy story. Englishmen of the day were fully convinced that they were descendants of the Trojans, and their sympathies, needless to say, were with the besieged of Ilium rather than their victorious besiegers. What more natural than that this great theme should find its way into the drama? Tatlock has listed with painstaking scholarship Elizabethan plays dealing, first with the siege of Troy in general, then with Troilus and Cressida, then with the strife of Ajax and Ulysses, and finally "with the calamities of some of the Greek chiefs after the fall of Troy."¹ To the last-named he might have added "Horestes,"² a curious early revenge-play by John Pikeriug, which, published in 1567, deals with the deaths of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra at the hand of the son of the murdered Agamemnon, Orestes. Into this revenge story, full as it is of stirring battle-scenes for the edification of the groundlings, Pikeriug has introduced in most strange fashion a number of allegorical figures, Truth and Fame and Nature, and, of course, the ubiquitous Vice of the early mysteries. In a general way it may be stated that "Horestes" is classical myth cast into chronicle play form, with figures of the Vice and Rusticus and Hodge, borrowed from the later moralities and interludes, thrown in to add the element of comedy. As this, to a great extent, is the nature of the four "Ages" and Heywood's "Rape of Lucrece," and as "Horestes" deals specifically with matter which Heywood also handles at the close of "The Iron Age," it "may be regarded as quite important in our study of Hey-

¹ "Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub.," 30, pp. 676-78.

² Tudor Facsimile Texts, "The History of Horestes," by John Pikeriug (1567).

wood's attempt to popularize the Troy story. It is one of the few extant dramatic handlings of the concluding episodes of that narrative, and may quite possibly have influenced Heywood. The songs that occur from time to time certainly suggest the songs of the merry Valerius in "The Rape of Lucrece," and the appeal of the play is throughout to the bourgeoisie.

Heywood's "Ages" are unique amongst the fairly numerous dramas of Troy in that they constitute a great play cycle. Where one play ends the next takes up the thread of the story, until we have a pentalogy of twenty-five acts and over one hundred scenes linked together. Heywood was the first English dramatist to collect plays in this fashion; that is, if we except the English history plays of Shakespeare.

The major portion of the "Ages," as has already been stated, has for its source Caxton's "Recuyell," but, as in the case of the "Troia Britannica," Heywood is no slavish imitator. There is much in the "Ages," especially the trilogy, that was gleaned from other authors, both classic and—if we accept the conclusions of R. G. Martin¹—English. Second in importance to Caxton, of course, is Ovid, from whose "Metamorphoses" "Fasti," "Tristia," "Ars Amatoria" and "Heroides" borrowings have been made. From Lucian's "Ὀνειρος ἢ Ἀλεκτρυών" has been taken the story of Gallus, the servant of Mars, who lets Mars and Venus oversleep and is changed into a cock for his negligence. Matter is also derived from the "Iliad" and the "Aneid" and from Plautus.

The debt of the "Ages" to Plautus is particularly interesting. It is to be found in the story of Jupiter, Alcmena and Amphitryo, which takes up all of Act II and a very small section of Act III of "The Silver Age."² The Latin comedy as it appears in "The Silver Age" has undergone several modifications—Ganymede, for example, taking the place of Mercury—and is quite extensively cut, but in the main, as

¹ "Notes on Thomas Heywood's Ages," Robert G. Martin ("Mod. Lang. Notes"), 1918.

² It is worth while noting in this connection the existence of another play on the same subject. "The Birthe of Hercules," a five act play in a British Museum MS. has been edited by M. W. Wallace. Written about 1600-6, it has been styled "a loose adaptation" of Plautus, and Tatlock finds no evidence of a connection between it and "The Silver Age."

Gilbert's¹ analysis shows, Heywood follows Plautus fairly faithfully. His departures from the structure of the "*Amphitryo*" are, as Gilbert further points out, "chiefly in the direction of the chronicle play," and are due in no small measure "to the insertion of the story of Hercules into a larger whole."

The English works cited by Tatlock and Martin from which Heywood possibly obtained material for his "*Ages*" need only be mentioned briefly. Peele's "*Arraignment of Paris*" and Greene's "*Euphues, his Censure to Philautus*" are the most outstanding of these, while Martin's contention that Heywood was indebted to "*Venus and Adonis*" for much in the language and situations in the Jupiter and Calisto and Venus and Adonis episodes is fairly convincing. So much then for the sources; to turn to the matter of the plays themselves.

It has already been noted that there is a distinct break in the pentalogy between "*The Brazen Age*" and the first part of "*The Iron Age*." It has further been noted that the trilogy differs in kind from the two concluding plays. Wherein do these differences lie? Let us turn our attention for a while to the "*Golden, Silver and Brazen Ages*."

The method in these plays is throughout that of the chronicle play. The earlier "*Ages*," have all the episodic disjointed nature of the early chronicle play. Instead of English history and English chronicles the dramatist has tried to place on the stage classical history, using his sources exactly as the writers of chronicle plays had used chronicle histories. There is no central figure and no great dominating event; the series is a grand panorama of scenes drawn from mythology and presented much as they came to the writer's fancy, save that an endeavour to preserve a chronological sequence has been made. Thus, we have the classical history of the world from the Golden Age of Saturn and of Jove, to and through the Silver and Brazen Ages of gods and heroes. The result has been a wonderful medley, full of countless personages—none, save Jupiter and Hercules perhaps, of really major importance—and abounding in scenes

¹ "Journal of Eng. and Germ. Phil.," 12, A. H. Gilbert, "Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus," pp. 594-96.

that leap with delightful unexpectedness from the spectacular to the comic, from the comic to the pathetic, and then back again to the spectacular. Truly a marvellous show for a bourgeois crowd, who had come to be surprised, amused and roused to pity all at once! No wonder the plays, despite their absolute lack of construction, were popular. A "combat with javelings" succeeded by Jupiter's amusing experiences in Danae's Tower; Hercules busy about his labours; the devils at every corner of the stage with fireworks when Pluto enters with his club of fire and burning crown; the diverting loves of Mars and Venus and of Hercules and Omphale; all a prelude to the sack of Ilium and the flight of Æneas, forebear of the British nation. What more could a sensation-loving crowd want? Here was a grand chronicle play series of a new type, dealing with a new and interesting subject, educational, at times even moral, for did not the evil power of gold lead to the fall of Danae? We need hardly dwell further on these points. If ever Heywood wrote for the approval of a citizen audience it was in this series.

And the plays which conclude the story, the two parts of "The Iron Age" are, it must be admitted, in much the same chronicle style. They do not, it is true, make use of the presenter (Homer) or of dumb-shows to fill in gaps in the narrative, but they have the same episodic nature. However, there is a marked improvement in structure for they are more unified and coherent than their predecessors. The explanation for this can be either of two things: either that they were written later in the dramatist's career when his technique was better, or that the very fact that they deal in the main with one great theme, the fall of Troy, tends to give them more unity. Certainly there is no one central figure about whom the action centres any more than in "The Golden, Silver, and Brazen Ages"; there is, however, a circle of figures who recur throughout and dominate the action.

Of necessity Part I of "The Iron Age" abounds in the presentation of battle-scenes, but much more than mere warfare is put on the stage. The rape of Helen, the story of Troilus and Cressida and Diomed, and the bitter jests of Thersites, a satirical figure, lend variety to this section of the double play. Of these the new satiric element is most interesting. Thersites

of course suggests the Thersites of Shakespeare, and it would be valuable to discover whether there is any relation between the plays. Certainly, the note of satire is a more mature note than any struck in the trilogy, and Thersites is a more cleverly drawn character than any in the preceding plays of the series.

In the middle of Part II Troy actually falls, and the poet, in order to stretch out his material to the required five acts, has to recount the adventures of the Greek heroes on their return. Heywood has already introduced a second sinister figure in the person of Sinon, whom Swinburne aptly styles "an amusing understudy of Thersites"; he now adds a third in the person of Cethus. Cethus does not appear until the beginning of the last two acts, and as Martin¹ so aptly points out, his presence so alters the whole tone of the play that it now becomes a new specimen of the revenge play. Cethus is the evil genius of the last two acts. Desiring revenge for the treatment of his brother, Palamides, he brings about by his cunning the death of Agamemnon, of Aegisthus, of Clytemnestra, of Pyrrhus, of Menelaus, in fact of all the leaders of note save Ulysses, before dying himself at the hands of Sinon, whom he himself slays. Orestes is represented as a second avenger. He has all the qualities of the typical hero of the revenge play: hesitation, irresolution and madness. The ghost who haunts plays of this type is also at hand, for Agamemnon returns from the dead to testify to the guilt of Clytemnestra. Unlimited bloodshed, intricate intrigue, conventional revengers, the ghost, the hero's madness, all these show distinctly to what genus these two acts belong. Here is another ingredient cast into the already overflowing caldron in which Heywood's strange mythological cycle was prepared.

And so we have in the four "Ages" a glorious spectacle for the populace, legend put into an intensely realistic form that they could grasp and appreciate. This realism reaches its heights, perhaps, in the more comic scenes, in which gods and goddesses are portrayed in a most human, even coarse fashion. "Jupiter," says Swinburne, "is a really brilliant and amusing mixture of Amadis, Sigurd and Don Juan";² and

¹ R. G. Martin, "A New Specimen of the Revenge Play" (*Mod. Phil.*, xvi).

² A. C. Swinburne, "The Historical and Classical Plays of Thomas Heywood" ("The Nineteenth Cent.," Vol. XXXVII, p. 652).

Venus, Mars, Neptune, Hercules, Jason and all the gods and demi-gods of Greek myth are treated with a sort of bourgeois familiarity that makes them themselves almost of the bourgeoisie.

Perhaps the most striking example of this is to be found in the scenes in which Danae is ravished by Jupiter.¹ The opening of the first scene of this episode is coarse enough to please the most vulgar. The four old beldams, who have been selected by Acrisius to keep strangers out of Danae's Tower, are engaged in animated conversation :

"*1st Beld.*: Heer's a coyle to keep fire and tow asunder. I wonder the king should shut his daughter up so close : for anything I see, shee hath no minde to a man.

"*2nd Beld.*: Content yourselfe, you speake according to your age and appetite. We that are full fed may praise fast. We that in our heate of youth have drunke our bellyfuls, deride those that in the heats of their blouds are athirst. I measure her by what I was, not by what I am. Appetite to love never failes an old woman till cracking of nuts leaves her. When Danae hath no more teeth in her head than you and I, I'le trust a man in her company and scarce then : for if we examine ourselves, wee have even at these yeares, qualmes, and rhumes, and devises comes over our stomaches, when we but look on a proper man."²

In the midst of their talk the alarm bell rings, and King Acrisius entering, commends the old hags for their watchfulness. After urging them to still more careful guardianship of his daughter, Danae, he leaves and Jupiter and the clown, his man, appear. They are dressed as peddlers, and have packs on their backs. Ringing the bell they induce the beldams to give them admittance in order that they may display their wares. They bear, according to the story told by the supposed peddlers, gifts from Jupiter himself to the crones, and the cupidity of the old dames is so aroused that they open the door and let them in. Then, while the clown engages the attention of the unsuspecting guardians of the tower, Jupiter himself pays court to Danae. Finally Danae, half-won over by her peddler-lover, goes to rest, saying as she leaves :

¹ "The Golden Age" (Pearson Ed., Vol. III), pp. 57-71.

² "The Golden Age" (Pearson Ed., Vol. III), p. 57.

"Yon is my doore, Dare not to enter there. . . ."¹

By now it is already late in the evening, and the beldams decide it is high time the peddlers were "pack't out of the gate." But the latter object to such poor hospitality, and, since they seem so humble and so harmless, are granted lodging in the tower for the night. Meanwhile Danae is put to bed, and during the night Jupiter in his imperial robes enters her chamber. Danae, though she pretends she resents the intrusion, does not give the alarm; and in an extremely coarse scene the rape is effected, Danae more than half consenting to it all.

How different is this from the semi-allegorical story of Danae as told in the classical legends? For the fanciful conception of the cloud of gold in which the god of classic myth descends into the lady's tower we have the realistic picture of a young gallant in disguise buying his way into his lady-love's bed-chamber. We can contrast Heywood's treatment of the subject with the way in which Lyly, the court-dramatist, would have treated it, and the vulgarization of the whole in the former's hands will be very evident. And it is the same all through the four "Ages." There is nothing delicate about Heywood's presentation of classical story, nothing abstract or allegorical; it is instead realistic and indelicate both in matter and in language. Indeed, it is almost a burlesque of the original; the gods and goddesses are after all merely human figures, men and women of London middle-class life, not majestic and divine figures living in a realm of poetry or imagination.

Pure horse-play is not infrequent in the comic scenes, and the dialogue is straightforward and almost childlike at times in its *naïveté*. Adventure there is in plenty, for those who desire it; bloodshed and battles for the bloodthirsty; strange wonders for those who love to be amazed. No very high art to be sure, but the sort of art to fulfil the poet's object—that is, to popularize the classics and present on the stage in a way that would draw large citizen crowds the story of great Troy's fall.

Of very much the same order is "The Rape of Lucrece," published by the writer himself in 1608, and appearing in no less than five editions during his lifetime, the last edition

¹ "The Golden Age" (Pearson Ed., Vol. III, p. 66).

being that of 1638. The exact date of composition of this work is uncertain, but critics unite in dating it after the accession of James I in 1603.¹ The source in general, according to Aronstein, is to be found in Livy (I, 47—II, 13) with, however, omissions, and alterations partly for dramatic purposes and partly through error on the part of the dramatist, who considers Collatia a part of Rome, and only makes mention of one consul. But after all historic truth is not his object.

The name of the drama is somewhat misleading, for the rape of Lucrece actually occupies only a portion of the drama, which is in fact a chronicle history of Rome under the Tarquins. Beginning with the assassination of Servius Tullius and the accession of Tarquin, the dramatist recounts the whole story of the usurper's career, ending his narrative with Rome's war with Porsena and the story of "how Horatius kept the bridge" against the Etruscan host. The chief themes in the Roman chronicle play may be briefly tabulated, perhaps, as follows:

1. The accession of Tarquin;
2. Aruns, Sextus, and Brutus consult the oracle at Delphi as to the fate of the Tarquins and return with its answer;
3. The quarrel between Sextus and Aruns and the desertion of the former to the Gabines is followed by his sudden change of heart, his murder of the Sabine leaders and his return to Rome to be appointed leader of the Roman army;
4. The story of the rape of Lucrece;
5. The rebellion of the Romans under Brutus, Lucretius and Collatine against the Tarquins; the war with Porsena and the valiant defence of Rome by citizen armies not unlike those that beat back Falconbridge's troops in "Edward IV."
6. The story of Horatius and of Scaevola and the conclusion of the play with a devastating series of personal combats in which Tarquin, Aruns, Brutus and Sextus all lose their lives, leaving Rome and the consulship to the injured husband, Collatine.

So far then the play is not remarkable. It is simply a narrative of early Roman history in the chronicle play style, with a dash of the revenge play in the activities and person of

¹ The mention of the King's Head Inn in a song sung by Valerius ("Rape of Lucrece," Pearson Ed., p. 198) is held as evidence of this by Fleay, Aronstein, *et al.*

Brutus,¹ who, like all avengers of Elizabethan drama, feigns madness for his own personal safety, and a domestic tragedy element in the story of Lucrece, the one theme by which Heywood's interest seems really to have been captured. The dramatization of the rape of Lucrece is really very cleverly worked out and is a vivid piece of work. There is in it real pathos and real dramatic power. Like the story of Jane Shore in "Edward IV," it is the true flesh and blood of an otherwise mediocre play.

But one thing in the drama is most extraordinary; that is the existence in it of Valerius and his songs. The "merry bard" Valerius is always singing, and his songs are never Roman. One of them is actually in good Scots dialect:

" Lament, ladies lament,
Lament the Roman land,
The King is fra thee hent
Was Doughtie on his hand
Weele gang into the Kirk
His dead corps weeie embrace
And when we see him dead
We ay will cry alas, Fa la."²

Another is a Dutch song and the remainder of the songs are English and often not too nice; songs of the wenches and of the taverns of good old London town. There is local colour and interest in the song of the Taverns:

" The Gentry to the King's Head
The Nobles to the Crowne
The Knights unto the Goulden Fleece,
And to the plough the Clowne."³

While the song:

" Packe clouds away and welcome day
With night we banish sorrow
Sweet ayre blow soft, mount lark aloft,
To give my love good morrow, . . ."⁴

¹ Even in Livy, however, Brutus is represented as feigning madness for his own safety, and Heywood, probably, merely followed the Latin historian in his characterization of him.

² "Rape of Lucrece," Vol. V, p. 181 (Pearson Ed., 1784).

³ "Rape of Lucrece" (Pearson Ed.), p. 198.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 227. This song also is printed amongst the Epithalamiums in "The Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas" (Edition by Bang., "Materialien zu Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas," V, III, p. 262).

possesses a lyric beauty that is in the very best Elizabethan tradition.

But why these songs should ever have been inserted into a dramatization of a classical story it is hard to tell. Doubtless there was a singer in the company for whom they were written. Certainly it was an uncritical audience that was willing to let them pass without comment on their inappropriateness, for on the whole they detract from, rather than add to, the drama.

Further comedy as a sop to the sort of house that frequented the Red Bull or the Cockpit is to be found in the antics and jests of the clown Pompey. Poor stuff this comedy for the most part, and not so far removed from the clowning of the Vice and his immediate successors on the stage, but evidently the type of comedy the people liked. Even in the most pathetic scenes this comedy is present. After the rape of Lucrece, a really touching episode, there is a distant anti-climax, which, it seems to me, destroys the whole effectiveness of the preceding scene, in the scene in which Valerius, Brutus and the clown discuss the sin of Sextus. For in this scene the dramatist in his endeavour to provide comic relief is coarse beyond all measure. The catch, "Did he take fair Lucrece by the toe, man," can scarcely be matched for pure vulgarity and nastiness. It reveals the extent to which Heywood could, on occasion, carry his vulgarization, and is a distinct blemish in the play, though it must have pleased his audience; for "The Rape of Lucrece," with all its looseness of construction and manifest dramatic weaknesses, was exceedingly popular, just as the four "Ages" had been. Like them, it dealt with wonders and horrors, had its comic elements, was tinged with the satiric in the person of Brutus, dealt with a domestic tragedy in a realistic fashion that all could appreciate, and finally was full of topical songs, that must have brought down the house. "Popularization," says Schelling,¹ "could go no further than this."

From the "Amphitruo" of Plautus, as has already been noted, Heywood drew the substance of his account of the birth of Hercules in "The Silver Age." But his debt to the Latin dramatist by no means ends with this play, for at least two other plays contain matter derived from Plautine comedies. "The English Traveller," considered elsewhere in this treatise,

¹ Schelling, "Elizabethan Drama," Vol. II, p. 27.

has for its sub-plot the story of the "Mostellaria," while the main plot of "The Captives" has as its source the "Rudens."

To A. H. Bullen belongs the credit for the discovery of the latter as a play by Heywood. Until its publication by him¹ it was to be found only in an unsigned MS. (Egerton MS. 1994) preserved in the British Museum. There is little reason to doubt that Heywood actually was the author, for both internal and external evidence point directly to him. In the Office Book of Sir Henry Herbert, under the date September 3, 1624, appears the following reference to the play: "For the Cockpit Company, a new play, called 'The Captives, or the Last Recovered,' written by Hayward";² while Bullen³ commenting on the work in the Egerton MS. 1994 says: "The next piece, entitled Calisto (leaves 76-95), which is written in the same hand, consists of scenes from Heywood's 'Golden Age' and 'Silver Age.'" Judson, whose edition of "The Captives" appeared recently,⁴ states in his introduction that he believes the manuscript to be autographic. Certainly it is written in a very difficult hand and is full of emendations such as the author himself might have made.

The play can be dated without difficulty and with a fair degree of exactness. Sir Henry Herbert's entry shows us that it was licensed in September, 1624, and metrical tests⁵ would seem to indicate that it was composed about that time. It is more like the "English Traveller" than any other of Heywood's plays, and this seems to have been acted about 1625.⁶ Thus we are fairly safe in saying that it was written in 1623-24.

The main plot is drawn, as has already been stated, from the "Rudens." It covers over two-thirds of the play, and in general follows its original very closely both in action and characters. Several sections, indeed, are translated literally from Plautus, though according to Judson "of the 2,000 lines that concern themselves chiefly with the plot, only about 350

¹ "Collection of Old English Plays," IV, pp. 99-227.

² Adams, "Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert," p. 29.

³ "A Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. II, p. 419.

⁴ "The Captives, or the Last Recovered," by Thomas Heywood (Ed. A. C. Judson, Yale Univ. Press, 1921).

⁵ Judson points out the numerous run-on lines, feminine endings, short and broken lines, and the absence of rhyme as evidence of this.

⁶ *Vide*, Thesis under "Plays of Contemporary Life."

represent a close verbal paralleling of his original," so that the proportion of literal translation is not so great. However, Heywood follows Plautus' story scene by scene, and only modifies his source when modification is absolutely necessary in the adaptation of the story to modern times.¹ The scene is laid in Marseilles; the time about 1550; the characters, that is the chief characters, whose excellence and noble nature are emphasized, are of course English. The temple of Venus in the "Rudens" becomes a very proper monastery, where the girls find shelter after the shipwreck.

Certain new elements are thrown into Plautus' play for variety, notably the echo-scene, the songs of Gripus and of Palestra and Mildew, which suggested at once the song element in "The Rape of Lucrece," and the final *dénouement*, when everything turns out splendidly, and both Palestra and Scribonia find fathers and husbands in a way that is little short of providential, and certainly most fortunate. Finally, this plot ends with a patriotic note characteristic of Heywood, as the "lost recovered" with their new-found parents and their lovers turn towards England to

" . . . see what welcome
Our London so much spoke of heare in France
Can give to woorthy strangers."²

The *dénouement* is the most interesting of these new elements, for it is extremely characteristic of Heywood's method. It is just the kind of *dénouement* that would delight his audience, which would not have been at all satisfied with Plautus' ending to this comedy. For it introduces just the romantic and human element necessary to please a city crowd. Instead of one lost child we have two, Palestra and her faithful friend, Scribonia; and each lost child is provided at the end with a lover, Palestra with Raphael, Scribonia with Treadway, Raphael's best friend. What could be more pleasing to an

¹ The best treatments of this point are to be found in A. H. Gilbert's "Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus" ("Journal of Eng. and Germ. Phil.," V, 12), in the Judson edition of "The Captives," and in Emil Koeppel's "Zur Quellenkunde des Stuart-Dramas" ("Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen," V, 97, pp. 323-9).

² "The Captives," Act V, Sc. iii, 1, 235-7 (Judson Ed., p. 144). More striking than this perhaps is the patriotic note struck by Ashburne in Act III, Sc. ii, 11, 87 ff. (pp. 85-87).

ingenuous audience? It is an improbable ending, no doubt, but yet it is extremely ingenious. Heywood knew he could sacrifice probability, if need be, for the sake of the proverbial happy ending; he knew how popular the happy ending would be, and he had absolutely no compunction about remodelling his source, whenever and wherever he could make a stronger appeal to the sympathies and tastes of his audience.

The sub-plot, which appears in modified form in the "*Gunaikeion*" (1624),¹ is derived directly or indirectly from a "*novella*" of Masuccio di Salernitano, the first of a series of fifty tales dealing principally with the escapades of the immoral priesthood.² The connection between this theme and that of the main plot is most tenuous, for it consists merely in the fact that the two girls, Palestra and Scribonia, seek refuge after the storm in the monastery in which the jealous priests of the sub-plot reside. Nevertheless, Heywood shows considerable skill in the way in which he develops the two stories side by side.

The story of the priests, it may be noted, is of the *fabliau* type. Friar John and Friar Richard are bitter enemies, though repeated efforts have been made by the benign old Abbot to reconcile them. The monastery in which their order lives has been founded and maintained by the Lord of Averne, upon whose wife Friar John has designs. Believing that she

¹ Bk. V, pp. 253-56, under the title, "*The Faire Ladie of Norwich*."

² G. L. Kittridge, "*Notes on Elizabethan Plays*" (*Journal of Germanic Philology*, II, 13), remarks that the underplot is merely a version of the well-known Old French *fabliau* of "*Le Prêtre qu'on porte*," already represented in English by the "*Mery Jest of Dan Hew of Leicestre*." Koeppel (*Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen*, Vol. 97, p. 327) suggests, "*Du Segretain ou du Moine*," "*Du Segretain Moine*" and "*Le Dit du Segretain*"—all to be found in Montaiglon et Raymond "*Recueil General . . .*"—as nearest to the tale in Heywood of French *fabliaux*. He also mentions the French translation by Antoine de Saint-Denis of Masuccio in "*Les Comptes du Monde Adventureux*." Judson, in his edition of "*The Captives*," points out how the narratives in the "*Mery Jest of Dan Hew*" and the three French *fabliaux* differ in essentials from the narrative of Heywood, and is of the opinion that Masuccio's version of the tale, rather than that found in the translation by Saint-Denis, was Heywood's source. His proof is by comparison between selected passages from the Italian, French and English versions. It may be noted that a situation similar to that in the sub-plot is to be found in Marlowe's "*Jew of Malta*" (Act IV, Sc. iii), when Friar Jacomo strikes the dead Barnardine.

reciprocates his feelings, he writes her a letter, which she in great anger shows to her husband. The Lord of Averne amazed decides to punish Friar John, and laying a trap for him assists in strangling him. Once the deed is done he is conscience-stricken, and in order to avoid being suspected of his death and to cast suspicion elsewhere has the body propped up in a privy in the monastery garden. Friar Richard finding John there strikes him, and when John, whom he had supposed alive, falls to the ground, is afraid he has killed him. Following the principle already laid down by the noble Lord, he then strives to avoid suspicion by dropping the body back into the Lord's garden, where it is found next day. D'Averne then decides to mount the dead friar in full armour on a stallion, and drive the horse out of the gates. Friar Richard, meanwhile in great terror lest the murder should be discovered and charged against him as John's known enemy, borrows a mare from a baker and flees. Whereupon the stallion pursues the mare; Richard recognizes his enemy John in the armoured horseman, and in terror confesses his guilt. D'Averne, however, comes to the rescue, explaining matters, and, thanks to the intercession of his noble lady with the Duke, is himself pardoned: with which the diverting story is brought to its conclusion.

The popular elements in a tale like this are obvious. The action is lively, and the situations fraught with a humour no less boisterous because it is grim. Realistic to coarseness, it contains at the same time certain moralizing elements. The lady is the picture of true wifely virtue; she does her best to dissuade her headstrong husband from the rash actions, which she suspects him to have in mind; and finally, when the deed is done, is the means of his pardon. The quarrelling friars are depicted in no favourable light, for friars were not popular in Protestant England. This was, indeed, the sort of comedy a rough audience would enjoy.

The main plot also is treated in bourgeois fashion. Ashburne, the father of Palestra, is a good English merchant, one of nature's noblemen, a true patriot and a loving father. With him and his fellow Englishmen are contrasted the immoral Frenchmen, Mildew and Sarleboys; with just England is contrasted unjust and evil France.

The presence of songs in the play has already been mentioned as an evidence of Heywood's desire for variety; the clowning, of which Swinburne speaks somewhat contemptuously,¹ is indeed very crude, fit only for the homeliest and most naïve of audiences. Though the play, therefore, is not of the same type as the "Ages" or "The Rape of Lucrece," it can, I believe, be considered in part at least a popularization of the classics in that it anglicises a classic comedy.

"Love's Maistresse," a dramatization of Apuleius' lovely story of Cupid and Psyche, was published in 1636, produced in the years 1633-34,² and may be contrasted with the foregoing plays in that it contains in allegorical form a condemnation of the tastes of the vulgar in its picture of Midas. In general, Heywood has followed his model with a fair degree of closeness, but he has given to the persons of Apuleius, the presenter, and of Midas and his son, the clown, an allegorical significance that gives to the somewhat flimsy, though charming drama, a peculiar interest and worth.

Apuleius, who as presenter speaks the prologues, submits the subject-matter and explains the allegory of it all, represents true art, a following after the noblest and the best, a strict adherence to high ideals and worthy subjects in literature. Opposed to him is Midas, champion of the rough tastes of the common herd, delighting in noise and vain shows and coarse comedy.

The play thus becomes a contention between true art and popular art.

"Wee two contend; Art heere, there Ignorance;
Bee you the Judges, we invite you all
Unto this banquet Academicall."³

To convince Midas of his folly in mocking the muses and despising the highest things in poetry, Apuleius has

¹ "Nineteenth Cent.," V, 38, "The Romantic and Contemporary Plays of Thomas Heywood," p. 400.

² Fleay has proved pretty conclusively ("Biog. Chronicle of Eng. Drama," Vol. I, pp. 298-9) that the public performance by the Queen's Comedians at the "Phoenix," referred to on the title page, was in 1633, the three royal performances in November, 1634. Inigo Jones designed the scenery for these court performances. The actors were not lords and ladies of the court, as was customary in court masques, but professionals.

³ "Love's Maistresse" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 93).

acted for him the story of Cupid and Psyche. The gods and goddesses of myth, Venus, Apollo and Cupid, are treated with something of the same realistic familiarity that was their lot in the earlier of the "Ages," though with more delicacy. Towards the close of the first act Cupid woos and wins Psyche, and Midas, who has watched all, cries out to Apuleius in great disgust:

"Hand off, let goe my sheepe-hooke, Ile not stay
Ile hang myself ere Ile see out thy play :
Call you this poetry."¹

To induce him to see the Cupid and Psyche play out, therefore, Apuleius endeavours to please him with a dance of the asses. The proud ass, the prodigal ass, the drunken ass, the usurer-ass, the she-ass, and the jack-ass dance in succession before them. Midas, of course, likes the last ass the best, and on being told he is his brother, rather pertly asks: "But where's your poet asse among all these?"² To which Apuleius replies, "There's no such creature."³ Midas' reply is apt:

"Then what calls't thou those
That let not men lie quiet in their graves,
But hant their ghosts with ballatts, and bal'd rimes ?
Doe they not teach the very feinds in hell
Speak in blanke verse ; do we not daily see
Every dull-witted asse spit poetry :
And for thy scene ; thou brings't heere on the stage
A young greene-sickness baggage to run after
A little ape-faced boy thou tearms't a god ;
Is not this most absur'd ?"⁴

Despite the long moralizing explanation of his "scene" given by Apuleius, we cannot help feeling that there is a certain amount of truth in Midas' words. Obviously he is advocating greater realism, and, after all, realism was one of the great things the bourgeois audience helped very materially to bring into the drama. It delighted in wild improbabilities, in the strange adventures of "The Foure Prentises of London" or the miraculous escapades of the gods of the "Golden" and "Silver Ages"; but wonders had to be presented in realistic fashion. The four prentices after all

¹ "Love's Maistresse" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 104).

² *Ibid.*, p. 106.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 106. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

were prentices; and the gods very plebeian divinities. The fanciful allegory of the court masques and the classical dramas of Lyly did not satisfy the vulgar crowd. It wanted action and life and reality.

Very significant is the clown's description of the Trojan wars in "Love's Maistresse." How different is the Troy from the Troy of the "Iron Age."

Clown: But heare me, oh you misse of misunderstanding; this Troy was a village of some twenty houses; and Priam, as silly a fellow as I am, only loving to play the good fellow, he had a great many bowsing lads; whom hee called sonnes.

3rd Swain: As we have heere in Arcadia.

Clown: Just the same; by this Troy ranne a small brooke, that one might stride over; on the other side dwelt Menelaus, a farmer, who had a light wench to his wife called Hellen, that kept his sheepe, whom Paris, one of Priam's mad lads seeing and liking, ticeth over the brooke, and lies with her despite of her husband's teeth; for which wrong, hee sends for one Agamemnon his brother, that was then High Constable of the hundred, and complaynes to him; hee sends to one Ulisses, a faire spoken fellow, and Towne-Clarke and to divers others, amongst whom was one stowt fellow call'd Ajax, a butcher, who upon a holy day, brings a payre of cudgells, and layes them downe in the mids't, where the Two Hundreds were then met, which Hector, a baker, another bold lad of the other side, seeing, steps forth and takes them up: these two had a bowte or two for a broken pate; and heere was all the circumstance of the Trojan Warres."¹

The satire in this is double-edged. First, of course, there is the delicious burlesque of the whole marvellous Troy story, a story the common-folk loved. Next, there is the satire on popular ignorance, of which the clown is a choice representative. He tells the Troy story as he misunderstands it, a garbled version of the narrative that shows his own dull comprehension.

Final judgment is pronounced on Ignorance when Apollo passes sentence on Midas after the latter has decided in favour of the champion of Pan in a singing contest with one of Phoebus' pages. True art is triumphant in the end; the apostles of

¹ "Love's Maistresse" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, pp. 113-14).

Ignorance, the common herd who throng the theatre, are, after all, the object of Heywood's ridicule. I am inclined to think that Aronstein is right in considering this play a retraction of what he had written for the stage in the past and a confession by the dramatist of his own shortcomings and failure to realize what the highest dramatic art should be.¹

So we have in "Love's Maistresse" a court masque written for the gentility. Into it are introduced some more popular elements, crude comedy and dances, but the poet apologizes for them by saying that these are the things the public wants, and makes them the basis for a sermon on the virtue of true art and the ridiculousness of the vulgar taste, a taste which in all his other dramatic works he has attempted to gratify. The old dramatist had apparently suffered a change of heart, and is perfectly frank in his expression of the fact. This, at least, we can hold to his credit.

This completes the last of Heywood's dramatic works based on classic sources, if we omit the various pageants,² which he wrote for London City and which, after all, are not really dramas but mere spectacles in praise of the city and her guilds, pot-boilers by an old poet, who had ceased to write for the regular stage but whose love for London and her citizens eminently qualified him for this task.

An attempt has been made to point out the distinctly popular and bourgeois elements in the individual plays. We have, first of all, the chronicle history method of narration in "The Four Ages" and "The Rape of Lucrece." With it is blended crude comedy and vivid realism; the past is carried over into the present and the gods and goddesses and heroes almost become contemporary figures, often of a very coarse type. In

¹ Whatever the case may be, I am inclined to question Fleay's assertion that the allegory is personal and that Heywood is attacking, in especial, Shirley and the Beestons. I do not think there is enough evidence to justify any such theory, however attractive it may be. The allegory of the masque is plain enough as it is; we do not need to introduce personal elements to give it added force.

² "London's Jus Honorarium," "London's Sinus Salutis," "Londini Speculum," "Londini Porta Pietatis," "Londini Status Pacatus," 1631, 1635, 1637, 1638 and 1639 respectively. Also "Londini Artium et Scientiarum Scaturigo" (1632) and "Londini Emporia" (1633), for which see F. W. Fairholt, "Lord Mayor's Pageants," Part I (Percy Soc. Pub.).

two plays songs are thrown in for variety, and the inevitable clown is at hand in all. The tendency throughout is to make legend more popular by coarsening it to suit the taste of the citizen crowd. Sometimes the patriotic note is struck, or we are given exhibitions of civic valour, as in "The Rape of Lucrece"; the stage settings are spectacular and intended to arouse wonder and its attendant pleasures; the action is rapid and disjointed but full of variety.

"The Captives" is a comedy closely following its classic source, but still, as has been shown, containing elements which were intended primarily to delight the house; "Love's Maistresse" is a play of masque-like nature, full of interludes thrown in as a sop to those present at the public performance of 1633, and at the same time a confession of the author's realization of his own desire, earlier in his career, to pander to the public. The city pageants, of necessity, were written merely to satisfy the vanity of the Lord Mayors and guilds, in whose honour and by whom they were staged. The very fact that Heywood was chosen as their writer shows that he, above all others, was a favourite of the bourgeoisie.

ROMANTIC DRAMAS AND DRAMAS OF LAND AND SEA ADVENTURE

It has been comparatively easy to select from Heywood's plays those which are either of the chronicle history type or are based on classical sources, but how are we to classify the remainder? The great variety of subjects and of tone that we find in these plays makes any adequate classification of them practically impossible, unless we introduce a multiplicity of new classes that would only serve to confuse, rather than to clarify.

Hence an extremely rough separation of them into two main divisions has been attempted—Romantic and Adventure Dramas and Dramas of Contemporary Life. In the first class have been put five plays, which are undoubtedly by Heywood:

The Foure Prentises of London.
The Faire Maid of the West.
The Royall King and Loyall Subject.
A Maydenhead Well Lost.
A Challenge for Beautie.

To these may be added two of the same general nature, which are ascribed to Heywood, though on questionable grounds: "Dicke of Devonshire" and "The Tryall of Chevalry."

To the second class of plays belong:

The Woman Kilde with Kindnesse.
The English Traveller.
Fortune by Land and Sea.
The Late Lancashire Witches.
The Wise Woman of Hogsdon.

Two other plays ascribed to Heywood, "The Fayre Mayde of the Exchange" and "How a Man may Choose a Good Wife from a Bad," complete this list.

It can readily be seen that to a certain extent the divisions overlap. Several of the dramas, which have so summarily been styled romantic or adventure dramas, contain elements that put them, in part at least, in the second class. This is true particularly of "The Faire Maid of the West," in which scenes from contemporary life—the inn scenes at Plymouth and Foy,

for example—abound. On the other hand, of the plays of the second class at least one, "Fortune by Land and Sea," in its picture of the battle with the pirates and narration of the events which ensue, can be considered romantic in that it is, in part, an adventure drama. Still, the division made is convenient, if not absolutely exact.

The earliest in date of the dramas that have been placed on the first list is "The Foure Prentises of London." The first extant edition of this play appeared in the year 1615, but that this was a reprint of an older edition seems indubitable. For in Beaumont and Fletcher's "Knight of the Burning Pestle," printed 1613, we find the citizen from his post in the pit advising the boy actor, who says "it will show ill-favouredly to have a grocer's prentise to court a king's daughter,"¹ to "read the play of the 'Foure Prentises of London,' where they tosse their pikes so."² That "The Foure Prentises of London" was published before "The Knight of the Burning Pestle," is borne out besides by the words of the author in his dedication of the work "To the Honest and High-Spirited Prentises, the Readers." Apologizing for the manifest defects of the play, he says that it could scarcely have found "a more seasonable and fit publication than at this time, when to the glory of our Nation, the security of the Kingdome, and the Honor of this Renowned Citty, they have begunne againe the commendable practice of long forgotten Armes, which I wish, the Discipline approve, and the encouragement thereof ever with my soule applaude."³ This reference to the resumption in 1610 in the Artillery Gardens of the exercise of arms by the London prentices has led most critics to believe 1610 or 1611 was the date of the first edition,⁴ from which they consider the dedicatory epistle was transferred wholesale to the subsequent 1615 edition.

Once the date of the first edition is established, there is no difficulty in arriving at the date of composition. In the same

¹ "Knight of Burning Pestle" (Ed. Murch), Act IV, Sc. i, 11, 63-64.

² "Ibid., 66-68.

³ "The Foure Prentises of London" (Pearson Ed.), Vol. II, p. 162.

⁴ Murch sets 1610 as the date of composition of "The Knight of the Burning Pestle." This fits in admirably with the date 1610 for the first edition of Heywood's play on which Creizenach, Aronstein, Murch, *et al.*, pretty generally agree.

dedication the dramatist declares it was written "in his Infancy of judgment in this kinde of Poetry" and in his "first practise," stating more definitely that "as playes were then some fifteen or sixteen yeares agoe it was in the fashion." Going back sixteen years from 1610 then, we can assume with a pretty fair degree of accuracy that Heywood wrote the play in 1594 or 1595.

The nature of the play itself justifies this extremely early date, for of all Heywood's plays this is, unquestionably, the least mature. The workmanship throughout is rude, the characterization negligible, and the dramatic technique poor. Bombastic language and unpolished versification mark a play that is both disjointed and unconvincing. But with all its weaknesses it was apparently admirably suited to the tastes of the audience to whom it was addressed.

A "true and strange" story, founded as the prologue tells us on "a manuscript, a book writ in parchement" containing "things concealed and obscure," it appealed very forcefully to the bourgeois and prentice crowd. For the literary tastes of the middle-classes had so been moulded by their interest in the romances of chivalry that their appetite for the strange and wonderful was immense. The mediæval joy in stories of Palmerin of England and Amadis of Gaul, of Guy of Warwick, Robin Hood, Adam Bell, and Sir Bevis of Hamptoun had, through the translations of Anthony Mundy and others, through ballads and through other means, become a middle-class joy. As those of higher degree began to tire of these tales of wonder, those of lower station read them with avidity, and even demanded that the heroes of romance appear on the stage to delight, amaze, and thrill the wandering crowd by their stirring feats of arms.

And so quite a number of these romantic adventure-plays arose, full of monsters, giants, enchanted forests and all manner of mysterious clap-trap. Murch, in the introduction to his edition of "The Knight of the Burning Pestle," has made a brief list of such plays:¹ "Common Conditions" (1576), "Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes" (1576?), "Orlando Furioso" (1588-89), "Uter Pendragon" (1589), all prior to 1594 and therefore to "The Foure Prentises of London." The

¹ "The Knight of the Burning Pestle" (Murch Ed.), *Introd.*, pp. lxxi.

list is by no means complete, but it is sufficient to reveal how popular drama of chivalry was. Heywood, a young would-be dramatist, newly arrived in London, at once saw his chance. He, too, would write a drama of romantic adventure, and to give it added appeal and a superficial air of reality he would make his heroes not knights but humble prentices, prentices of old London city, fighting not merely for fame but for the honour of their craft. Thus, says Aronstein, he effected a synthesis between realism and romance—not, it is true, an inner synthesis but an outer synthesis, which reveals the professional playwright in him.

The actual sources of his work we do not know. It has been suggested that he may have used an early drama on the same subject, "Godfrey of Bulloigne,"¹ and the fact that the olde Earle of Bulloigne and the Bullenois appear in "The Foure Prentises of London," gives a good deal of colour to the suggestion. Another source was possibly the partial translation of Tasso's "Gerusalemme" by Richard Carew, which appeared in print in 1594,² though this is less likely. It is certain that Heywood did not take his story of the conquest of Jerusalem directly from Tasso, and just how much he was indebted to him is extremely uncertain. I am inclined to believe, personally, that the bulk of the matter must have been derived from a romance no longer known, or perhaps from several romances, which the author very cleverly blended together, and that neither the "Gerusalemme" nor the play of "Godfrey of Bulloigne" had very much to do with Heywood's play. Certainly it has all the earmarks of the mediæval romance.

The dramatic method is derived from the old chronicle histories, for, like the rest of Heywood's early dramas, the play is rambling and disjointed, and has often to take recourse to dumb-shows or the presenter to bridge over gaps in the narrative. There are four prentices, brothers it is true, but often separated and undergoing entirely different experiences,

¹ Henslowe, July 19, 1594, "R/ at 2 pte of Godfrey of bullen iii & xi s"; mentioned thereafter twelve times till Sept. 16, 1695. Greg ("Henslowe's Diary," Pt. II, p. 166) is inclined to identify this play with "Jerusalem," acted by Strange's Men, Mar. 22, 1592, but does not believe, with reason, that "Godfrey of Bulloigne" and "The Foure Prentices of London" could ever be the same play.

² Warton, "History of English Poetry," Vol. IV, p. 350.

and their adventures and those of their father and sister have to be woven into one plot. And though taken big and large the weaving is done with as much skill as one might reasonably expect, the play cannot help being loosely constructed. A brief analysis of the plot will make this evident:

The Earl of Bulloigne, deprived of his wealth and banished from his earldom, lives in citizen retirement in London, with his four sons, Godfrey, Guy, Charles and Eustace, and his daughter, Bella Franca. The four sons are the four prentice heroes; for Godfrey is bound to a mercer; Guy to a goldsmith; Charles to a haberdasher; and Eustace to a grocer. But the Earl is dissatisfied with his new mode of life. Resolved to die, he decides to set out for the Holy Land, hoping to meet death there. Therefore, before he leaves he calls his sons together to acquaint them with his plans.

There are all proud of their trades. Godfrey, the eldest, amid torrents of applause from the audience no doubt, says of the mercer's vocation:

"I prayse that Citty which made Princes Tradesmen:
Where that man noble or ignoble borne,
That would not practise some mechanicke skill,
Which might support his state in penury,
Should die the death; not suffer'd like a drone
To sucke the honey from the publick Hive,
I hold it no disparage to my birth,
Though I be borne an Earle, to have the skill
And the full knowledge of the Mercer's Trade.
And were I now to be create anew,
It should not grieve me to have spent my time
The secrets of so rich a Trade to know,
By which advantage and great profits grow."¹

Guy and Charles are equally loyal to their callings; Eustace, the youngest, alone regrets that his trade is so confining—he is very much of a child anyway.

But when their father tells them of his purpose to "see the Holy Land" their love of adventure is too powerful to be restrained, and desiring a more heroic career they set sail for France in order to enlist under Robert of Normandy in his crusade.

"Let's try what London prentises can doe,"² cries God-

¹ "The Foure Prentises of London" (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 170).

² *Ibid.*, p. 174.

frey in his enthusiasm, and each resolves to wear the arms of his trade on his shield.

Their voyage, however, proves disastrous, for as the presenter explains to us, their vessel is shipwrecked and they are separated. Godfrey is cast ashore in France, and, leading certain citizens of Bulloigne in a successful attack on invading Spaniards, is elected by them Earl of his father's own realm. Guy is also carried to France, and reaching the court, is immediately wooed by the King's daughter, whose suit he rejects on the ground that war is his only mistress. Of course, the King of France then appoints the gallant stranger commander of the 10,000 men he is sending on the crusade. Charles travels farther afield. His plank carries him to Italy, where he rescues his father out of the hands of bandits, and himself becomes captain of the robber band, whom he purposes to reform. Eustace, less fortunate than his elder brethren, floats to Ireland, and finding the society of the Irish kerns disagreeable, and the prospects of knightly glory in that land poor, resumes his way toward Jerusalem. The presenter at this point interrupts the action to explain that:

"Four London prentises will ere they die,
Advance their towring fame above the skye;
And winne such glorious praise as never fades,
Unto themselves, and honour of their trades . . ."¹

The action now becomes fast and furious. Eustace by some queer quirk of fortune reaches Italy and rescues his father, the old Earl, from a villain and a clown, who are about to rob him of the money which Charles, the bandit chief, has given him. At this point Charles enters, and of course there is a fight between the brothers, which is only brought to a close by the timely appearance of Bella Franca, their sister, also in Italy. She is pursued by an outlaw, who would have ravished her, and tells her story to her brothers, who strangely enough are unable to recognize her or each other, and, falling in love with her, fight for precedence in her favour. But, on news being brought of the advance of the forces of Prince Tancred against the outlaws, Eustace accepts the rank of lieutenant under Charles, and both lament the fact that they have no Eastcheape, Canwicke Street, Londonstone, and Cheapside boys to help them in the

¹ "The Foure Prentises of London" (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 178).

battle that seems impending. Tancred, however, makes an alliance with them, takes Bella Franca as an hostage, and they all decide "to march with speed towards the holy warres."¹

Meanwhile Godfrey and Guy have not been idle. With Robert of Normandy they march through Italy on their way to Palestine, neither of them knowing the other in the lofty position to which they have now attained. Tancred, of course, resents this intrusion into his kingdom, and for a while strife seems imminent between the champions of the two armies, Godfrey and Guy, and Charles and Eustace. But, finally, they decide to join forces against the common foe, the heathen. All four brothers and also Tancred and Robert now love Bella Franca, and are only stopped from quarrelling by her threat to scratch out her eyes, if they do not desist from their squabbling. However, it seems absolutely impossible for them to live without altercation, and Guy and Eustace are banished because of their rivalry, not now for the lady, but on the field of battle. Bella Franca, distracted by her suitors and the French princess, who in her love for Guy has followed the army disguised as a page, at this point flee together to the woods, where they meet Eustace, and brother and sister (*mirabile dictu!*) recognize each other.

From now on the plot begins to unravel itself. Godfrey and Charles are discovered to each other by their father, whom they have rescued from captivity in Jerusalem; Eustace and Guy save the Christian host by their timely arrival on the battlefield, when the pagans are about to gain a signal victory; Jerusalem at last is conquered; and all ends well with Guy, King of Jerusalem and husband of the French princess; Eustace, King of Sicily; Charles, ruler of Cyprus; Godfrey of Bullogne wearing an honourable crown of thorns; and Bella Franca safely married to Prince Tancred.

It is easy to understand why matter so improbable and so ridiculous as this should have aroused the mockery of Beaumont in "The Knight of the Burning Pestle." It is pure nonsense beyond question, but how admirably the young playwright has sensed the feelings of his crowd. Burgher valour has been extolled, the arms of the city trades have been glorified, the vanity of the prentice and his citizen employer has been tickled.

¹ "The Foure Prentises of London" (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 196).

The play, too, has been full of stirring adventures, the action has been kaleidoscopic and startling; the appetite for romantic action has been satisfied to the full. The characters have little real personality, but great variety; there are the prentice heroes, the bandits, the love-lorn princess in disguise, the fabled Soldan and the Sophy and the Irish kerns; a medley of ill-assorted figures, each of interest in himself.

To provide the humour there is the inevitable clown, jesting coarsely as he threatens the old Earl whom he is bent on robbing, ever-present and ever out-of-place, a clear concession to the predictions of the theatre-crowd.

Of course, the patriotic note is struck. Heywood never fails to sing the praises not merely of London but of Albion, and Robert of Normandy in his census of his troops pays tribute to England, Scotland and Wales as follows;

“From England, the best brood of martial spirits,
Whose wals the ocean washeth white as snow,
For which you strangers call it Albion;
From France, a nation both renown’d and fear’d,
From Scotland, Wales, even to the Irish coast,
Beyond the pillars great Alcides rear’d,
At Gades in Spaine unto the Pyrene hils,
Have we assembled men of dauntless spirits,
To scourge you hence ye damned infidels.”¹

Pure bombast, no doubt, but the sort of bombast that in a theatre like Heywood’s must have paid. At any rate, the play we know was printed at least thrice.² This seems to indicate for it no small measure of popularity.

Adventure drama of a very much higher order, however, is to be found in that most delightful of comedies, “*The Faire Maid of the West*.” An intensely exciting drama of the sea, this play contains in addition realistic elements, actual burgher figures and scenes from contemporary life that mark a tremendous advance over the strange coincidences and wild improbabilities of “*The Foure Prentises of London*.” We have left the fantastic wonderland of the romances and entered that of genuine adventure, and the result is indeed most pleasing.

First printed in 1631, in “as it was lately acted before the King and Queen with approved liking by the Queen’s

¹ “*The Foure Prentises of London*” (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 243).

² 1610, 1615, 1632.

Majesties Comedians"—probably as Fleay adds at Christmas 1630—there are in the edition a prologue and epilogue both addressed specifically to "Their two Majesties at Hampton Court." That this performance before royalty was an immense success can be seen from the pardonable pride with which Heywood, a remarkably modest man at all times, writes to Thomas Hammon, Esquire, of Gray's Inn, that "it hath not onely past the censure of the Plebe and Gentry; but of the Patricians and Praetextae; as also of our royall Augustus and Livia."¹

We can be equally sure that its presentation before "the Plebe and Gentry" was at an earlier date, and that the Hampton Court performance was the revival of a play that had already attained great popularity. The exact date of composition is most uncertain, but 1622 as a *terminus ad quem* has been accepted by all critics. This is the date which Fleay ascribes to the play on the grounds of an allusion which he sees in the lines,

"It is not now as when Andrea lived
Or rather Andrew, our elder journeyman,"²

to Andrew Cane, who was an actor at the Cockpit in 1622.³

J. P. Collier⁴ on the basis of internal evidence believes the play to have been written before the death of Elizabeth. He also publishes a ballad of the year 1617, which Fleay denounces with some heat as a forgery, in which reference is made to "Bess Brydge's Gowne and Muli's Crowne" and the destruction of the Cockpit by the prentices of London. Whether this ballad be a forgery or not it seems highly probable that Collier

¹ "The Faire Maid of the West" (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, pp. 257-58).

² *Ibid.*, Pt. I, Act V, p. 324.

³ Fleay finds further evidence for accepting this date, in what he considers a "by-reference to the Queen of Bohemia" ("Biographical Chronicle of Eng. Drama," I, p. 296).

"And you the mirour of your sex and nation,
Fair English Elizabeth, as will give cause,
Ere you depart our Court, to say great Fesse
Was either poor or else not bountiful . . ."

("The Faire Maid of the West," II, Act V, p. 423). However, Fleay admits that 1632 is only a guess on his part, and a guess, as it seems to me, based on the very slightest of evidence.

⁴ J. P. Collier, "English Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage," Vol. I, p. 402-4.

is nearer the truth as to date than Fleay. Schelling and Ward agree on 1603, while Aronstein sets a date between 1600 and 1603, a time when the spirit of the great English seamen still filled the hearts of their fellow Englishmen.¹

Certainly the time of the action is 1597, the year of the ill-fated expedition of Essex against the Azores and the Spanish East and West India fleets, an expedition which in the list of *dramatis personæ* has been confounded with the Cadiz Expedition of the preceding year. But the story of Essex only forms the background of the earlier scenes of the play; it merely gives reality and contemporaneity to the glorious deeds of Bess Bridges, the valiant British barmaid and her gallant gentleman-lover, Spencer.

Whence, then, did Heywood derive his brave and beautiful heroine? The source of the story of Bess: if there was any, was probably a ballad or tract of sea-adventure. Perhaps Heywood got his suggestion for the courageous girl, who sets out to revenge her lover's supposed death from the ballad of "the valorous acts performed at Gaunt by the brave bonnie lass, Mary Ambree, who in revenge of her lover's death did play her part most gallantly."² That he knew the ballad is obvious from Bess' statement of herself:

"I could do all that I have heard discourst
Of Mary Ambree or Westminster's Long-Meg."³

The deeds of Long-Meg of Westminster are recorded in a tract entered in the Stationers' Register, August 18, 1590, and reprinted in "*Miscellanea Antiqua Anglicana*" (1816). Long-Meg entered the service of a landlady who had an assiduous

¹ Aronstein (*Anglia* 37, p. 226) sees echoes from Shakespeare's plays in two short passages. "*Julius Cæsar*" (1600-1) is suggested by the words of Bess ("*Faire Maid*," Part II, Act iii, p. 385)—

"No, first with Roman Portia, I'de eate fire
Or with Lucretia character thy lust
'Twixt these two breasts."

The words of Clem ("*Faire Maid*," Part II, Act v, p. 416)—"And my motto shall be, Base is the man that paies"—can be compared with "*Henry V*" II-1-160 (1599). "*Pistol*: Base is the slave that pays." If there be any worth in these cross references, "*The Faire Maid of the West*" must have appeared after 1599-1600.

² Percy, "*Reliques*," II, 19. References to Mary Ambree are to be found in "*Epicoene*," "*The Tale of a Tub*," "*The Fortunate Isles*," "*The Scornful Lady*."

³ "*The Faire Maid of the West*," Part I, Act II (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 284).

Spanish suitor, Sir James of Castile. On the instigation of her mistress she donned male apparel, and drubbed Sir James much as Bess drubbed Roughman, though Sir James did offer a stouter resistance. It is possible in the light of this that Heywood may have made Bess a combination of Mary Ambree and Long-Meg, perhaps even throwing Mary Frith, the heroine of "The Boarding Girl," in for good measure.¹

Whatever her literary ancestry, Bess Bridges, daughter of a Somersetshire tanner, is a citizen heroine even more estimable than the four prentices. Capable in business, she runs her inn in a manner that arouses the admiration of all her neighbours and clientele. Famous for her beauty, she is faithful in love despite all efforts to woo her from her absent lover. Resolute and courageous in action, she inspires others to like resolution and bravery. What heroine more likely to charm the gay city lads, who gathered in search of amusement at the Cockpit?

The story opens in Plymouth just as the expedition of Essex is about to set sail. The little town is full of bustling sea-captains and eager gentleman-adventurers. The talk is of distant islands and galleons and gold. The most popular tavern in town is that kept by Bess, "The flowre of Plimouth," where "there's the best wine" and the quickest service. All her customers, of course, extol her beauty: all unite in commenting on her wondrous modesty. Spencer, her favoured lover, gentle of rank and deed, accompanied by his friend, Captain Goodlack, is, of course, amongst those who frequent the inn.

The scene is one of the greatest realism. Drawers scurry to and fro with sack or claret or rolls and trenchers. Bess herself aids in serving, as the guests of the hostelry bawl out their orders. It is a scene such as Heywood can paint to perfection—a typical London scene.

In the midst of all the revelry there is bloodshed. Carroll entering insults Bess and Spencer, and there is a tavern brawl in which Spencer kills his foe. All is now confusion, and a cry

¹ Katherine Lee Bates. Introd. to Ed. of "The Faire Maid of the West" (Belles Lettres Series): "It is curious to note, however, that in Clerkenwell, where Heywood lived, was a 'woman that wore man's apparrell and went by the name of Thomas Barber,' buried Jan. 15, 1658. The Clerkenwell (St. James) registers record, too, the burial of an Elizabeth Bridges, Aug. 16, 1665.

goes out for the constables. Spencer in fear of the law is forced to flee the country, and decides to join in the Essex expedition. But before leaving England he has a last meeting with Bess at night on the famous Hoe. To her he gives his picture to keep ever and also a tavern at Foy—Fowey, a little port in Cornwall—of which she is to be the mistress. Then, urging her to be true to him through all changes of fortune, he leaves her. A dumb-show depicts the departure of the "island" expedition and the story is continued with Bess established in the Windmill Inn at Foy, and doing a rousing and prosperous business. Clem, the clown of the play, a delicious character, is her vintner, a dependable servant despite his somewhat impertinent speech. One among many suitors for Bess' hand is Roughman, a bully and a braggart; but, faithful to Spencer, Bess scorns the courtship of all alike. Roughman, however, makes himself very objectionable by his overbearing ways towards the servants, and Bess, suspecting that he is a coward, determines to teach him a lesson. To effect this, like Long-Meg of Westminster, she dons male attire, and, meeting him in a field near Foy, humiliates him signally, no doubt to the mingled cheers and laughter of the audience. At the time Roughman does not know the name of his assailant, but on learning it, is much shamed and imbued with a new courage that later is to make him one of Bess' most trusted henchmen.¹

Meanwhile Spencer, having landed at Fayal, is apparently mortally wounded while endeavouring to end a street affray between two quarrelsome captains. Expecting death, he sends his comrade, Goodlack, back to Bess, willing to her all his property, if she has proved faithful to him, but bestowing it on Goodlack himself if she is false. Goodlack on the eve of his departure on his mission gets news of the death of Spencer—not, it afterwards turns out, the Spencer of our tale but a namesake—and, thinking over his friend's will, decides to do his best himself to be the legatee. Meanwhile, the true Spencer sails in a merchant vessel for Mamorah in Barbary, intending thence to sail to England.

¹ There is a likeness between the exposure of Roughman and that of Falstaff in "Henry IV." Like Roughman, Falstaff, until Prince Hal proves him a liar, boasts of the brave fight he has put up against his assailants. Falstaff, however, when he is exposed, is in no way shame-faced, whereas Roughman is overcome with shame.

Goodlack soon arrives in Foy and is met by the Mayor, who gives him an excellent account of Bess :

“To our understanding
Shee’s without staine or blemish well reputed,
And by her modesty and faire demeanour,
Hath won the love of all.”¹

Despairing of finding any ill-report regarding one so widely known for her chastity, he takes Spencer’s picture from her, falsely accusing her of immorality, but is moved to compassion, finally, by the greatness of her love and her virtue. Relenting, he tells her all, and seeks her hand in marriage. On being refused he becomes her true friend, and joins with her in plans for a voyage she now intends in search of her supposed dead Spencer’s grave. Before sailing she makes a will, which is read by the Mayor of Foy, leaving her goods to different charities.

From now on we are in the realm of exciting adventure on sea and land. Spencer is captured in a sea-fight with a Spanish vessel, and defies his captors with true English pride and patriotism. “These Englishmen,” exclaims the Spanish captain.

“ . . . nothing can daunt them : Even in misery they’ll not regard their masters.”²

Bess meanwhile setting sail, reaches Fayal and is about to bombard the town, when the Spanish ship in which Spencer is a prisoner is seen in the offing. There is a vigorous sea-fight, and of course Bess is victorious, Spencer being among those rescued from the Spaniards. When Spencer is brought face to face with Bess, she believes the ghost of her supposed dead lover is before her and is carried fainting to her cabin. Spencer and his merchant friend are given the Spanish ship by Roughman, and after dividing the spoil the two vessels part company, the merchant having determined to continue his journey to Barbary. On his arrival there, his vessel is detained by the orders of Mullisheg, the King of Fesse. Bess meanwhile recovers from her swoon and resumes her voyage. Finally, rich with spoil, her ship “The Negro” puts in at Mamorah for water, and Mullisheg, interested in the reports he has heard of

¹ “The Faire Maid of the West,” Part I, Act III (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 297).

² *Ibid.*, Part I, Act IV (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 307).

her, invites her to his court. He receives Bess with great honour and wishes to load her vessel with gold, but Bess refuses the gift:

“Captaine touch it not
Know King of Fesse my followers want no gold,
I only came to see thee for my pleasure,
And shew thee, what these say thou never saw'st
A woman borne in England.”¹

The national note is struck, and the fame of England and England's Queen extolled:

“The Virgin Queene so famous through the world,
The mighty Empresse of the maiden Ile,
Whose predecessors have ore-runne great France,
Whose powerful hand doth still support the Dutch,
And keepes the potent King of Spaine in awe,
Is not she titled so?”²

The adventurers have a glorious time at Fesse. Clem, the clown, becomes tremendously amusing. He assumes a grand air and a royal manner, as he orders slaves and pashas about. He snatches eagerly at the honourable post of chief eunuch, only to object strenuously when he discovers what the position entails. For pure comedy he is without question the most delightful of Heywood's many clowns; the incongruity of his position in the court is in itself sufficient food for mirth.

With the mutual recognition and marriage of Spencer and Bess the first part of the play ends. The second part, which is no less thrilling, is full of new adventures, which are so like in spirit those already recorded that mere mention of them is all that is necessary for our purposes. Till the end of Act III the voyagers are still at Fesse living in an atmosphere of intrigue and terror, from which, thanks to their cleverness and their nobility of character, they are finally released.

Certain scenes in these three acts are, however, especially worthy of notice in that they contain matter which must have particularly delighted the audience. During the escape under cover of night from Fesse, Spencer in order to ensure the safety of his companions finds he must separate himself from them. Bess at first refuses to leave him, but he promises her

¹ “The Faire Maid of the West,” Part I, Act V (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 322).

² *Ibid.* (323).

that on the morrow she will see him safe and sound on board "The Negro" and she gives a grudging consent. With Goodlack and Roughman she makes her way successfully to the ship, but Spencer, though he manages to get out of the palace gates, is captured by a noble "bashaw," Joffer. He tells Joffer of his promise to Bess, and his generous captor knowing him to be a man of honour sets him free to keep his appointment with her on condition that he returns to him by three on the morrow. For if Spencer does not return, Joffer himself will surely be put to death.

The great scene, of course, takes place, when despite the pleas of his friends, Spencer, the honourable and brave English gentleman, keeps his promise to Joffer by appearing before Mullisheg just in time to save the "bashaw." How the audience must have shouted their approval! What a wonderful episode a situation such as this would make for a moving picture of to-day! Here was the hero, who left his wife to face almost certain death in order to keep his sworn word to a gallant foe. Spencer is thus given an opportunity to show his innate worth, and Mullisheg, who has been the chief persecutor, relents. The play should properly end here, but Heywood by the laws of the stage has still two acts to fill out. Hence the last two acts, which are concerned with adventures and trials successfully faced in Italy, give the impression of being somewhat loosely tacked on.

But, of course, everything ends happily, and the spell-bound citizen crowd is satisfied. They have had scenes of excitement and sea-adventure, such as their own mariners were wont to experience. They have been carried abroad to strange lands, and seen English valour triumphant over great odds. The Spaniard has succumbed to the dauntless spirit of a tanner's daughter; the Sultan of Fesses has bowed before her beauty and the gallantry of the true-born English gentleman, her lover. Patriotism and civic pride have been gratified; the clown has provided for them the most exquisite amusement. And many scenes, too, have contained vivid pictures of contemporary life in England, with which all of them were familiar. The note of morality, too, is a note which they could well appreciate. Heywood is very particular to dwell on the chastity and loyalty of his heroine, and on the sterling

qualities of Spencer. The burgher likes his heroes and heroines to be virtuous, and Heywood, despite his occasional coarseness, is, as has been stated before, always a moralist. Virtue is always rewarded and vice punished in his plays. And after all is this not a healthy attitude towards life?

So we have in "The Faire Maid of the West" a really splendid blending of realism and romantic adventure, a tale with an appeal to all ages and all red-blooded peoples. Of its own kind it ranks very high, and can, I think, with justice be considered among Heywood's masterpieces.

Distinctly less bourgeois in tone is "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject," a romantic drama of a different order, a story not of knight-errantry and wonders or of sea-adventure, but of the almost quixotic loyalty and patience of a "Martiall" of England, whose liege lord subjects him to all manner of indignities. The fact that Heywood is here trying his hand at a romance based on an Italian "novella," an Oriental story of Anobarzanes and Artaxerxes told by Bandello (I, 2), and from him taken over through a French translation into Painter's "Palace of Pleasure" (Tome II, Fourth Novel)¹ in itself explains the change of tone. We are no longer dealing with a purely popular story, but rather with a story told in the Italian and in Painter for the higher classes, and thence adapted by Heywood for the stage.

The exact date of the play cannot be determined, but that it was an early play seems certain. The "Epilogue to the Reader"² acknowledges the play to be old at the date of its publication (1637).

"That this play's old 'tis true, but now if any
Should for that cause despise it we have many
Reasons, both just and pregnant to maintaine
Antiquity and those too, not al vaine.
We know (and not long since) there was a time,

¹ First pointed out by E. Koeppel in his "Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's, John Marston's, und Beaumont's und Fletcher's" (1895), pp. 133-35, and discussed at considerable length with excerpts from Painter in Kate Watkins Tibbals' edition of "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject" (U. of Penn. Pub., 1906), pp. 10-26.

² Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama," points out that this appears too in H. Shirley's "Martyred Soldier," "and probably belongs to neither, being a stock epilogue belonging to the company, applicable to any old play." Its insertion, however, he believes proves the play old.

Strong lines were not lookt after, but if rime,
O then 'twas excellent: who but believes,
But doublets with stuft bellies and bigge sleeves,
And those trunke-hose which now the age doth scorne,
Were all in fashion, and with frequence worne;
And what's now out of date, who is't can tell,
But it may come in fashion and sute well?
With rigour therefore judge not, but with reason
Since what you read was fitted to that season."¹

Ward,² from a comparison of the reference to "doublets with stuft bellies and bigge sleeves" and "trunke-hose" with Fairholt's costume in England" (p. 217), considers the time of composition to have been "about the close of the century," and Miss Tibbals³ and Aronstein, on both external and internal evidence, accept a date before 1603 as probable, the latter preferring 1601. On the basis of such evidence as we possess this date seems quite reasonable.

Fleay⁴ is inclined to question Heywood's sole authorship since he regards "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject" as a revision of the "Marshal Osric," of 1602, which he ascribes to Heywood and Wentworth Smith.⁵ Miss Tibbals, however, has considered this suggestion very carefully and pointed out the weaknesses in Fleay's theory, concluding that "on the slender evidence now produceable" the identification of "Marshalle Oserecke" with the play may well be rejected, and that Heywood's single authorship in the light of the style and the statement on the title-page may remain unquestioned.⁶

¹ "The Royall King and Loyall Subject" (Pearson Ed., Vol. VI, p. 86).

² Ward, "English Dramatic Literature," Vol. II, pp. 560-61.

³ "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject" (Ed. Kate Watkins Tibbals, Introd., pp. vi-vii).

⁴ "Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama," Vol. I, p. 300.

⁵ The references to this play in "Henslowe's Diary" appears as follows: "Lent unto the compayne, the 20 of September, 1602, to paye Mr. Smythe, in pte of payment of the boocke called Marshalle Oserecke, some of ii li." "Pd unto Thomas Hewode, the 20 of September, 1602, in fulle payment of his boocke of Oserecke the some of ii li." "Pd at the apoyntment of the compayne, the 3 of November, 1602, unto the tayller for the mackynge of the suite of Oserecke, the some of xxvis."

⁶ "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject" (Ed. Kate Watkins Tibbals, Introd. pp. 7-10). In the excellent introduction to this edition Miss Tibbals has discussed in full the question of the date and source, and has, in addition, made a very careful comparison of the play with Fletcher's "The Loyal Subject" and Chapman and Shirley's "Chabot, Admiral of France," with the latter of which it has nothing to do.

The main plot as has already been indicated is derived from the rendition of Bandello's novella in Painter's "Palace of Pleasure." In brief the narrative is as follows: A marshal of England is so high in the favour of his King that two noble lords become envious of his position and slander him to his royal master, asserting that his acts of magnanimity are prompted by the desire to excel his lord in fame for courtesy and gallantry. Moved by their insinuations, the King determines to test his great subject, and both degrades him and banishes him to his country estate. Further to try his loyalty, he then commands him to send the fairer and dearer of his daughters to court to do his royal pleasure. The marshal at once sends the elder and, as it happens, the less fair, whom the King loves at sight and makes his Queen. Some time after, Isabella, the Queen, now pregnant, in accordance with her father's instructions informs the King that she is really less beautiful and less dear to her father than her sister, Katharine. The King, enraged, sends her with her dowry back to the marshal, demanding that Katharine be sent to him at once. The marshal, however, pleading that Katharine is ill, detains her until the Queen's child is born, and Isabella herself has recovered, then sending them both to the court together. The King is so happy at the return of his wife that he reinstates her as Queen, and gives her sister, Katharine, to the prince, who has fallen in love with her. The marshal now returns to court bringing with him his greatest gift to his master, the child of Isabella, and the King requites his generosity by bestowing on him the hand of the princess. But the marshal is unwilling to accept the princess' dowry, for he cannot bear the thought that his wife should be his superior and his mistress. The jealous courtiers, of course, make this a new cause for slander and the marshal is tried in court and condemned. However, Isabella, Katharine, the prince and the princess unite in pleading for him, and he is pardoned and honoured, his enemies being punished.

Heywood is not alone in his use of this rather complicated plot for dramatic purposes, for Fletcher's "The Loyal Subject" is based on the same story.¹ A comparison of the two plays such as has been made by Miss Tibbals reveals very clearly the

¹ A summary of the plot of "The Loyal Subject" is to be found in the Introduction to Miss Tibbals' edition of Heywood's Play (pp. xiii-xix).

difference in method of the two men, and shows us how, even in one of the least patently bourgeois plays of the former, he is nevertheless a writer for and of the bourgeoisie.

For, in the first place, Heywood has in general followed his original closely, just as he did later in "The Captives," and in some cases has almost reproduced the language of his source.¹ He has, of course, condensed the narrative where feasible and necessary ; and, in a manner that is typical of his method, has joined to the whole a sub-plot, which, loosely linked to the main plot, provides the ingredients of contemporary city life and coarse humour, which his audiences demanded of him.

The sub-plot may be summarized very briefly. A captain returns from the wars in rags and apparently impoverished. He appeals to his former friends for help, but they scorn his ragged attire, and refuse to have anything to do with him. The only one of his acquaintances to recognize him is Lady Mary Audley, to whom he had been betrothed before leaving for the wars. The soldiers, who had served under him, desert him with the exception of the clown, who remains loyal through thick and thin ; inn-keepers turn him out indignantly because of his clothes ; the inmates of a bawdy-house will none of him till they see the colour of his money. Finally, he reveals the fact that he is really rich after all, returns the scorn of his fair-weather friends, and marrying the Lady Mary, his true love, ends his career high in the King's favour.

The whole is a satire, of course, on the power of riches. To the false friends "clothes make the man," just as they do to the inn-keepers and the women of ill-fame. Just as long as a man can ruffle it in fine raiment and swagger with the most splendid, he is sure to be respected and served, but let true worth wear tattered garments, and no one will be moved.

"Though ragged Virtue oft may be kept out,
No grate so strongly kept above the center,
But asses with gold laden, free may enter."²

The appeal to the Elizabethan crowd in satire such as this is obvious. Heywood is voicing the complaint of the poor of

¹ Miss Tibbals cites as examples "The Persian History," the description of the horse-shoe incident, the will and the banquet scene.

² "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject" (Pearson Ed., Vol. VI, p. 21).

his day against the rich, and what gives his words added force is the vividness of the pictures he paints. There is Hogarthian realism, for instance, in the picture of low life at the brothel. It is coarse but convincing, and relieved of much of its nastiness by the evident desire of the writer to preach a lesson. The very ugliness of the language makes the picture of the bawds more revolting. The captain's words of upbraiding are especially powerful:

"Or who would buy diseases
And make his body for a spittle fit
That may walk sound?"

This is straight speech, and speech in the interests of clean life.

Other scenes are equally realistic; the scene in the inn; the scene where the captain parts company with the corporal; the amusing scene cast headlong into the play of the clown and the Welshman in the forests, disputing as to the comparative greatness of the organs in Paul's and at Rixam (Wrexham).

There is nothing at all like this in Fletcher's "The Loyal Subject." Painter's story therein suffers many modifications. The scene of Painter's tale was laid in Persia, and that of Heywood's in England, but Fletcher selects for his story Russia, and gives to his characters Russian names. He is concerned only with the idea of the Persian story—that of a subject whose devotion and loyalty is put to very severe tests by his over-lord—but has reconstructed the details of the play in such a manner as to give greater unity to the whole. The result is a much better drama, better motivated and more coherent.

The satirical elements which appear in Heywood's sub-plot appear also in Fletcher, who seems to have written with a copy of "The Royall King and Loyall Subject" before him. But Fletcher has woven these sub-plot elements into the very texture of the main plot. Theodore, a son of Fletcher's "loyal subject," Archas, takes the place of the captain of Heywood's play, but has none of his realistic London-life experiences. Fletcher is not interested in the city, and refrains from painting scenes of city activity, since they would only distract attention from the important figures of his plot. Besides, he is not writing for the bourgeoisie, and does not have to pander to their tastes with portraits of spendthrift

gallants and clowns and comic Welshmen. In short, Fletcher is writing pure romance, sensational and at times even melodramatic, as in his banquet scene, when the Duke orders a black gown to be given to Archas as an intimation that he is condemned to death,¹ while Heywood is merely dramatizing a romantic tale to suit his audience, writing hurriedly and making few changes in the actual matter of his original, but throwing into that original an amalgam of vivid realism, moralizing and crude clowning, such as is characteristic of his work throughout.

Least suited to a bourgeois audience of all his plays is, however, "A Mayden-Head Well Lost." The reason for this is possibly that it was written, so far as we can discover, quite late in his life, when he seems to have lost connection with his troop, and had become a literary free-lance, selling his work where he found a market.

Published by Heywood himself in 1634,² "A Mayden-Head Well Lost" has all the marks of late composition. The versification, for example, shows no rhyme and is full of run-on lines. There is no marked division into main plot and sub-plot, for all the threads of the complicated story are closely bound together. We need only to compare the handling of the varied themes in this play with the loose handling of main plot and sub-plot in "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject" to see the advance in technique. The story of the captain in the latter has only the slenderest connection with the story of the King and his long-suffering marshal, but the stories of the loves of Julia and Parma and Lauretta and Florence are an essential part of each other.

In addition it may be noted that the epilogue intimates that the play was a new play.

"Our play is new, but whether shaped well
In act or scene, judge you, you best can tell."³

Thus on the basis of this evidence—unfortunately, all that has yet been procured—we may reasonably accept Aronstein's⁴ conclusion that 1633 is the date of composition.⁵

¹ Fletcher, "The Loyal Subject," Act IV, Sc. v, li, 25 ff.

² Entered Stationers' Register, June 25, 1634.

³ "A Mayden-Head Well Lost," Epilogue (Pearson Ed., Vol. IV, p. 165).

⁴ "Anglia," 37, p. 257.

⁵ Fleay's attempt to identify it with "Joan as Good as my Lady" (Henslowe, 10 and 12/2/1599) is entirely unconvincing.

Like "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject," this romantic comedy appears to have had its origin in a hitherto unidentified Italian "novella." The situation from which it derives its title, it has been pointed out by Aronstein, is somewhat similar to that in Shakespeare's "All's Well that Ends Well," of which the main plot is based on Painter's version of the story of Giletta of Narbonne, but it would be unwise to place too much emphasis on this similarity. But that Heywood's primary source was Italian seems clear from the nature of the play; its elements of complicated intrigue, of mistaken identity, and the Italian names of the dramatis personæ. A short sketch of the plot will make this clear.

Stroza, secretary to the Duke of Milan, through slanderous reports brings about a quarrel between the Prince of Parma and Julia, his betrothed, the daughter of the Duke of Milan, with whom he has already consummated marriage before the formal ceremony. To Julia he makes the charge that Lauretta, daughter of the faithful General Sforza whom he hates, is the Prince of Parma's mistress; to the prince that Julia has been unfaithful to him. As a result Julia has Lauretta and her mother banished, both taking refuge in the domains of the Duke of Florence. The Prince of Parma, meanwhile, led by Stroza to doubt Julia's fidelity, has deserted her. A little later a child is born to her, and exposed by Stroza and her father, only to be rescued and brought up by Parma, who begins to realize Stroza's villainy. Milan now arranges a marriage between Julia and the young Prince of Florence who has already become acquainted with Lauretta, and with whom the latter has fallen in love. Through Parma, reports reach young Florence that his proposed bride is unchaste, and he agrees to marry her only on condition that on his bridal night he find the report untrue. The Duke of Milan is thus in a dilemma, but Stroza says he will save the day by getting the virgin Lauretta to take Julia's place for the night on the understanding that she leave before morning. Lauretta to save the prince's honour, since she knows Julia is not a virgin and is therefore unworthy of the prince, is persuaded to do so, and during her stay with the prince receives from him a ring and a bill of indenture for her dowry. In the morning Julia is found

in the chamber according to Stroza's plan, but Laretta's possession of the ring and the document reveal the whole scheme. The play ends with the marriage of the Prince of Florence and Laretta, and a reconciliation between Parma and Julia through their child, Stroza having confessed his guilt.

This it can be seen is a more or less conventional plot of the romantic-comedy type, and there is little in it that is peculiarly bourgeois. In fact, perhaps the only things in the play, in what we may call the characteristic Heywood manner, are his introduction of the faithful clown, and of dumb-shows to help out his action over difficult places; but the realism of the city scenes in "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject" is entirely absent. Heywood is no longer addressing his work directly to a citizen audience, and, therefore, "A Mayden-Head Well Lost" for our purposes is a play of little significance.

In "A Challenge for Beautie," published in 1636, and probably the last of Heywood's dramas,¹ the bourgeois elements are more prevalent. The play was acted at "Black-friars" and at the "Globe" on the Bankside before June 17, 1636 and after May, 1634. The date, 1634, is determined by an allusion in it to the punishment of the puritan Prynne in the lines:

"If e're it be my luck to see thee preach through a pillory, as one of the cast lions of your cursed crew did not long since, the hangman shall have you by the eares for this."²

A prologue which characterizes the dramas of different nations, and the epilogue, a brief appeal for favourable criticism, give no further information as to the date of composition, so that one can only assume on the basis of the somewhat meagre evidence cited that it must have been composed between 1634 and 1635.

The sources of both the main plot and the sub-plot are by no means certain, but suggestions have been made which are of very considerable interest. In the first place it has been pointed out that the main plot bears certain resemblances to Shakespeare's "Cymbeline" and to Massinger's "The Picture."³ In

¹ I omit consideration of the city pageants, which can hardly be considered in the field of legitimate drama.

² "A Challenge for Beautie," Act III (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 41).

³ "Old English Plays" (1815), Vol. VI, p. 325, Ed. by Dilke.

"Cymbeline," which is based on a novella by Boccaccio, as in the main plot of "A Challenge for Beautie," the heroine has a ring, which has been given to her by her lover, stolen from her by the villain of the piece, and the loss of the ring is held as proof of her unchastity. But the resemblances between the play and Massinger's "The Picture" are, as Koeppel¹ points out, even greater.

In "The Picture," which is founded on a tale by Bandello (I, 21) as told by Painter in his "Palace of Pleasure" (Vol. II, 28), the knight Mathias leaves for the wars bearing with him a magic picture, by which he can always tell whether his wife has remained chaste to him. Rising to distinction through his valour on the field of battle, he attracts the notice of the court, and the virtues and beauty of his wife, Sophia, are in the mouths of all. Honoria, the Queen, is roused to jealousy at the thought of a rival in glory amongst women, and sends two courtiers to seduce Sophia, who, however, proves steadfast in her chastity and triumphs in the end.

In "A Challenge for Beautie" Isabella, Queen of Spain, believes herself without peer in worth and loveliness, the counterpart of the vain queen, Honoria, of Massinger's play. Her husband, King Sebastian, is weak and uxorious, as is King Ladislaus in "The Picture." Bonavida, "a noble and honest Spanish lord," frank and plain-spoken like Massinger's Eubulus, protests against the pride of Isabella, and is banished by her till he find a woman who is her equal. Accompanied by a clown, an indispensable adjunct to Heywood's plays, he wanders all over the world in vain search, until finally he discovers the lady of his quest in England, in the person of the noble Hellena. Having wooed and won this lady, he leaves a ring with her as a pledge of his faith, and returns to Spain to inform Isabella of his success. From now on his position becomes similar to that of Massinger's Mathias. Isabella, of course, is very angry that any rival should be so discovered, and, like Honoria, sends two nobles to make trial of Hellena's virtue. So far the two plays are similar.

But from now on, argues Koeppel, Heywood's main plot is more like that of a Spanish comedy by Lope de Rueda, the

¹ Koeppel, "Quellen studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's, etc." (Muenchener Beitrage XI, pp. 145-51).

"Eufemia,"¹ from which he believes it to have been derived not directly but through a prose-version of the same story, in which certain changes had been made.

Whatever be the source, Heywood's main plot may be concluded as follows: The two Spanish nobles, Pineda and Centella, arriving in England, through the help of Hellena's maid, who steals her mistress' ring while she is washing her hands, obtain sufficient evidence for false charges against her, and return to the court of Spain, where they convince even Bonavida of her faithlessness. Isabella then has Bonavida cast into prison, and he is condemned to death. Hellena, however, has followed Pineda and Centella to Spain, and stops the execution, demanding that justice be given her. She then charges Pineda with having stolen from her a valuable slipper, the mate to which she displays. Pineda in reply says he never saw her before in his life, and Centella, who is accused as party to the deed, gives a like reply. Thus they fall into the trap she has laid for them, for if their words be true then their claim that she had been seduced by them is false. Bonavida is saved, and Hellena's honour redeemed, and the play ends happily.

The sub-plot, which is loosely connected to the main plot through the fact that Mont Ferrers, the chief character therein, is a brother of Hellena, presents to us a contest of courtesy not unlike that in "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject." The theme is an old one, and reminds us, says Koeppel,² of the story of Alexander and Lodovicus in the "Historia Septem Sapientum." This story appears in English literature in a ballad, "The Two Faithful Friends: The pleasant history of Alexander and Lodovicke, who were so like one another that none could know them asunder; wherein is declared how Lodovicke married the Princesse of Hungaria in Alexander's name, and how each night he layd a naked sword between him and the Princesse because he would not wrong his friend";³ and in a drama,

¹ A synopsis of this play is given in J. L. Kein's "Geschichte des Spanischen Drama's" Band II, pp. 144-56 (Leipzig, 1872)—a discussion of the similarities between the play and "A Challenge for Beautie" is to be found in Koeppel, q.v.

² E. Koeppel, "Quellen studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's," etc., p. 148.

³ Printed by H. Gosson, in "Pepysian Collection." Reprint by Th. Evans, in "Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative" (in 6 volumes, London, 1810), Vol. I, pp. 77 ff.

"Alexander and Lodovicke,"¹ mentioned by Henslowe as first performed by the Admiral's Men on January 14, 1597, and thereafter fifteen times in all till July 15. That the drama fell into Heywood's hands and was used by him in his sub-plot is very possible—at any rate, he was with the Admiral's Men at the time of its performance and so it is certain that he was acquainted with it.

Petrocella, the daughter of Aldana, a Spanish grandee, is heroine of the sub-plot. She is loved by Valladaura, a brave Spanish sea-captain, but spurns his suit. Mont Ferrers, a gallant Englishman, is captured by the Turks, and ransomed with his friend Manhurst by Valladaura, who in a fight at sea between the English and Spaniards' fleets had been his most dread foe. The Spaniard treats the Englishman well and requests him to woo Petrocella for him. But Ferrers at first sight falls in love with her himself, and is torn between love for the lady and duty towards his benefactor. True to Valladaura, he gets Petrocella to promise to marry the Spaniard. Valladaura, however, has overheard all, and is so struck by the Englishman's integrity and worthiness, that he plans to test him still further. Accordingly he compels Ferrers to act as priest at his wedding to Petrocella, and then desires him to spend the night in his place in bed with his newly-wed wife without so much as kissing her. In the morning he charges Petrocella with adultery, but at this point she enters with a bloody poinard in her hand, saying she has killed her bed companion. Valladaura now laments the loss of Ferrers, but Petrocella's story turns out to be a mere ruse, for the noble Englishman appears, proves that he has kept his promise to Valladaura, and is finally given her as wife by his erstwhile enemy. Thus ends the contest of courtesy between the two.

There are in the play, thus, two plots, lacking any real connection with each other, as is so often the case with Heywood, but alike in that each presents us with a contest between characters—English on the one side and Spanish on the other. English Hellena vanquishes Spanish Isabella in a trial of virtue and beauty; English Mont Ferrers is equally triumphant in a trial of chivalry and friendship with the gallant Spaniard, Valladaura. The drama, says Ward, "is in truth written

¹ "Henslowe's Diary," W. W. Greg, Vol. II, p. 182.

throughout in a vein of the most blatant national self-consciousness."¹ Rivals for the peerless queen, Isabella, are not to be found in Spain. "There are so many Mores int;"² nor in Portugal, frigid Russia, Italy, France ("what the pox should we speak of that, knowing what is bred in the bone will hardly out of the flesh"),³ but

" Albion

Breeds wondrous choyse of Beauties, wise and lovely,
Scarce to be matched in all the world besides . . ."⁴

and thus in London Bonavida finds Hellena, fairest and best of her sex.

"The chiefe Paragon.
Of Beautie match't with Virtue"⁵

". . . noble by birth, yet not so high degreed as her
great virtues merit, nor her means to counterpoyse her
beauty."⁶

Like Bess Bridges, here was a heroine for the citizens, a lady of London, who by her loveliness, her worth, and her resourcefulness won for herself a noble husband and for her country the honour which the audience felt was its due. How the crowd must have roared at the discomforture of Centella and Pineda; and how they must have applauded when Isabella finally acknowledged her defeat.

Equally popular must have been the figure of Mont Ferrers. Valladaura first describes him to Petrocella as follows:

"At sea I met with a bold man of war,
And somewhat more an *Englishman*:"⁷

and the description admirably expresses the feeling of the Elizabethan bourgeoisie. Later, when Valladaura in the slave-market asks Mont Ferrers whether he be not Ferrers of England, the hero, though he knows he is dealing with a foe, replies:

"Rather than deny . . .
My name and country, I'll acknowledge any
Thing base or deadly: I confesse you know me,"⁸

and his bravery in the face of death is emphasized.

¹ "Cambridge History of English Literature," Vol. VI, Ch. 4.

² "A Challenge for Beautie," Act III (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 16).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 16. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁵ "A Challenge for Beautie," p. 20. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Act I (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 14).

⁸ *Ibid.*, Act II (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 24).

But it is his loyalty in friendship that really distinguishes him. As our study of the plot has revealed, he bears the severest tests with patient endurance, and finally overcomes his enemy by his display of true virtue. The cavalier ideal, which he represents, certainly appealed to the crowd; he was the gentle hero of old romance come to life again and "more an Englishman."

The tone of the play thus is notably patriotic, a bourgeois patriotism into which has been cast some of the improbability and chivalric convention of the old romances. But there is little else that is very notable about it. We have the typical Heywood clown, Bonavida's servant, not particularly funny but faithful unto death; old Aldana, the character to whom, as to Josselin in "Edward IV" or "Hobson" in "If you Know Not Me, You Know No Bodie," is tacked as a distinguishing catch-phrase, the words "my further honour still"; and the song thrown in for variety, this time a repetition of one of Valerius' songs in "The Rape of Lucrece," a description of the habits of men of different nationalities.¹ The action is complicated, and in the case of the sub-plot almost tragi-comedy in the sudden turn of fortune and element of suspense in the *dénouement*, when for a moment it appears that Petrocella has killed her English lover. Taken as a whole there is a lot of popular stuff in the drama. The national note, in especial, would win the crowd; and the element of suspense with all ending happily in the big fifth scene, characteristic of all tragi-comedy, bourgeois or otherwise, would contribute its share to the success of the performance before the London bourgeoisie.

This leaves us with but two plays, both still somewhat doubtfully ascribed to Heywood, to consider in this class. The first of these, "Dicke of Devonshire," is to be found in Egerton MS. 1994, and is reprinted in A. H. Bullen's "Collection of Old English Plays" (Vol. II, pp. 1-99), along with "The Captives," which has already been considered. This play, based on the prose account of the adventures of a certain Richard Pike of Tavistock,² Bullen in 1883 ascribed to Thomas Hey-

¹ "A Challenge for Beautie," Act V (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 65); "Rape of Lucrece" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 216).

² Stationers' Reg., July 18, 1626. Published under title "Three to One," in Arber's "English Garner," I, 621-639.

wood, largely on the grounds, firstly, that the subject-matter was not unlike in a general way that in "The Faire Maid of the West" and "Fortune by Land and Sea," and secondly, that it was handled in Heywood's typical manner.¹ Fleay,² however, on the basis of the phrase near the end of the play, "To Tell the King the Storyes of Two Brothers," identifies it with James Shirley's "The Brothers," of 1626. The fact that a conversation concerning the Armada in the play appears to set the date of production in 1626, thirty-eight years after the Armada, gives a certain colour to this theory,³ but Nason⁴ points out that Shirley, a Catholic, would hardly permit his hero to scorn the sacrament of confession; and that the style does not resemble Shirley, but adheres closely to the narrative of the pamphlet in a manner that to me would suggest Heywood. I am, therefore, inclined to agree with Bullen, that if the play is not Heywood's it is certainly very similar to his work, and can, in the absence of further evidence, best be ascribed to him. The date of composition seems to have been 1626.

The story of Richard Pike, from which it gets its title, is certainly one after Heywood's own heart. In 1625 an expedition under the Earl of Essex, son of the famous Essex, favourite of Queen Elizabeth, is sent against Cadiz; and among the seamen of the English fleet is Dicke of Devonshire, bluff, brave, and at the same time pious, the sort of a sailor who under Drake and Raleigh had made his homeland famous. Of course, the fact that the expedition is against Spain suggests the glorious days of the Great Armada, and we are given a scene in which two English merchants, living in Xeres, discuss the reasons for the lasting hate between the two countries. The dramatist, in this scene, strikes both the patriotic and the anti-catholic note. Here, for instance, is the Elizabethan national spirit:

"When we sett our feete even on their mynes
And brought their golden fagotts thence, then ingotts
And silver wedges; when each ship of ours
Was able to spread sayles of silke, the tacklings

¹ A. H. Bullen, "Old English Plays," Vol. II, p. 3.

² Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. II, pp. 236-37.

³ "Dicke of Devonshire," Bullen ("Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. II, p. 16).

⁴ A. H. Nason, "James Shirley, Dramatist," pp. 63-69.

Of twisted gold ; When every marryner
 At his arrivall here had his deepe pockets
 Crammed full of pistoletts ; when the poorest ship-boy
 Might on the Thames make duckes and drakes with pieces
 Of eight fetch out of Spayne ; These were the billowes
 Which blew the Spanish bonfires of revenge ;
 These were the times in which they call'd our nation
 Borachos, Lutherans, and Furias del Inferno."

" The very name of Drake
 Was a bugbear to fright children ; nurses still'd
 Their little Spanish nynnies when they cryde
 ' Hush ! The Drake comes.' " ¹

And then the Armada comes, " whales " and " huge Leviathans of the Sea," as the first merchant describes them, and is faced with wondrous courage, which the terrors of the Inquisition only whetted. Equally Elizabethan and equally popular with the Protestant bourgeoisie is the note of religious animosity and fanaticism in these lines :

" Albeit we heard, the Spanish Inquisition
 Was aboard every ship with torture, torments,
 Whippes strung with wyre, and knives to cutt our
 throates,
 But from the armed winds an hoast brake forth
 Which tare their shipps and sav'd ours. Thus I have
 read
 Two storyes to you ; one why Spayne hates us,
 T'other why we love not them." ²

With the expedition against Spain then sails Dick Pike in the " Convertine "—the name is taken from " Three to One "—and in the attack on Cadiz does valiant service for which he wins the commendation of his captain. Going ashore, he is present when three English seamen are ambushed and shot down by the Spaniards. He himself is attacked by Don John, a Spanish colonel, whom he disarms. Don John is begging for mercy when twelve Spanish musketeers come to his rescue, and overpower the doughty Pike, bearing him off to imprisonment. The wounded vanity of the Spanish knight from now on makes him Dick's bitter enemy, but Don John's wife, Catalina, does her best to alleviate the Englishman's sufferings, and Teniente, the judge, and Don Fernando, the

¹ " Dicke of Devonshire " (Bullen Ed., p. 14). ² *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

governor, both admire his valour and, pitying him, give him the best of attention in prison.

The sentimental note is sounded by the dramatist in Dick's longing for his wife and children and good old Tavistock. To Mr. Woodrow, a fellow prisoner about to be released, he says :

"Once more let me give you this to remember,
And 'tis my last request : that when your better stars
Shall guide you into England youle be pleased
To take my country Devonshire in your way
Where you may find in Taverstoke (whom I left)
My wife and children, wretched in my misfortunes.
Commend me to them, tell them and my friends
That if I be, as I suspect I shall be
At Sherris put to death, I died, a Christian soldier
No way I hope, offending my just King
Nor my religion, but the Spanish lawes."¹

"This chaine," he remarks elsewhere, "is so long it reaches from Sherrys to Tavistock in Devonshire,"² and the writer of the play—Heywood or not, as the case may be—has given us real pathos in passages like these. The pious reply of Pike to the father confessors who are sent to him before his trial is straightforward and forceful;³ the sort of reply a simple Protestant audience would understand and applaud.

Tried before Fernando and Teniente, Dick gives further proof of his indomitable spirit, and he is pardoned by the King of Spain and offered a pension if he will enter his service. Pike, however, refuses, saying he wants to see the smoke of English chimneys once more, and departs loaded with honour and gifts.

Such is one of the two distinct plots of the play—like Heywood's plots they run side by side rather than in and through each other—the second plot is of the tragi-comedy type, and concerns the fortunes of two brothers, Manuel and Henrico. Henrico is an unmitigated scoundrel, ravishes the noble Eleanora to whom he is betrothed, and in order to get his elder brother out of the way and succeed to his father's property charges him with the murder of their father, Don Pedro Guzman, who, as it so happens, is still alive. Manuel thus is tried for murder at

¹ "Dicke of Devonshire" (Bullen Ed., p. 51). ² *Ibid.*, p. 68.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

the same time that Henrico appears before the court to answer Eleanora's charge of rape, but both are condemned to death. The timely arrival of Don Pedro, and Henrico's confession, however, bring about the required happy-ending, for Eleanora, a forgiving soul, accepts Henrico as her husband according to Spanish law, and Manuel, who had done no wrong, of course escapes the gallows. A typical clown, Buzzano, provides the usual stock of poor and coarse jokes, and is besides instrumental in bringing about the *dénouement*, since he contributes evidence that leads to Henrico's conviction.

The tragi-comedy is sentimental and rather poorly worked out. Henrico is a dyed-in-the-wool villain; Manuel a truly noble hero. Both are characters of the type that might readily appeal to a bourgeois audience, but on the whole this section of the play contains less of those bourgeois elements that we have been accustomed to in Heywood than the story of Dicke Pike, and therefore need hardly concern us longer.

"The Tryall of Chevalry," which also appears in Bullen's "Collection of Old English Plays,"¹ is entered in the Stationers' Register, Dec. 4, 1604, and was first printed in 1605, "as it hath bin lately acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Darby his servants." It is ascribed by him to Chettle or Munday or both, and he also suggests that it "may be the play by Chettle and Wentworth Smith, entitled 'Love Parts Friendship,'"² mentioned by Henslowe on May 4, 1602. Fleay says it is certainly by two authors, one of whom may, though this is quite doubtful, have been Heywood.³ He suggests that, since the chief tragic character in it is Burbon, it may perhaps be identified with the play of that name acted by Pembroke's and the Admiral's Men in 1597; but thinks it more likely that it is "Burone," mentioned by Henslowe, September 25, 1602 and October 2/3, 1602. In support of this he says that the entry almost immediately preceding that of September 25 in Henslowe is to "adicyons of cuttyngdicke," Sept. 20, 1602, and that this, undoubtedly, refers to Dick Bowyer. Greg, proving the identification with "Burone" ridiculous, believes the play to have been "Bourbon,"

¹ A. H. Bullen, "Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. III, pp. 263-356.

² "The Tryall of Chevalry" (Bullen Ed., "Old Eng. Plays," Vol. III, p. 263).

³ Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of Eng. Drama.," Vol. I, p. 289, Vol. II, pp. 318-19.

and regards Heywood as part author.¹ The name Sarlaboys² can certainly be connected with Sarlebois, in "The Captives."

I have read the play over carefully several times, and, though my first reaction was against believing it Heywood's, I have been won over to faith in the theory of his partial authorship. Certain popular elements in it can be pointed out; elements which, more than anything else, have seemed to indicate Heywood's authorship. First, of course, there is the attempt on the dramatist's part to catch the eye of the public with his sub-title, "The life and death of cavaliero Dick Bowyer." Dick is a rough and ready warrior, like Dick Pike, always ready for a fight, the plain soldier hero, whose exploits would thrill a plain audience. Secondly, we have in Pembroke, a perfect English gentleman, such as was Mont Ferrers in "The Challenge for Beautie" or Spencer in "The Faire Maid of the West." The tone of the play, besides, is intensely patriotic. "Lusty, my harts, for the honour of England, and our brave general, the Earle of Pembroke,"³ cries Bowyer at one point in the action, and it is the honour of England that is always at stake. The language, especially of the comedy scenes, is rough and full of city slang and oaths, while a servant character, Peter de Lyons, has a pet phrase, "to avoid prolixity," which he uses on all occasions. As a whole, the play may be termed a romance of chivalry, full of the din of arms and boastful speeches, and containing situations which are absurd at times, but far less absurd than those in "The Foure Prentises of London," which, if we accept Greg's date (1597 c.), for "The Tryall of Chevalry" was written at, approximately, the same time.

This concludes our study of the individual plays, which we have chosen to class as romantic dramas. An attempt has been made to indicate the more distinctly bourgeois elements in each play, and it remains for us only to note in a general way

¹ Greg, "Henslowe's Drama," Vol. II, pp. 187, 231; and "Henslowe's Papers," p. 120, for connection with Admiral's Men.

² "Tryall of Chevalry" (Bullen Ed., Vol. III, p. 350).

³ "The Tryall of Chevalry" (Bullen Ed., Vol. III, p. 287). It is worth noting that the play of "Bourbon" was performed by Pembroke's and the Admiral's Men; hence the appearance in the play of Pembroke as the heroic Englishman would be a compliment to the patron of the company.

the methods by which Heywood endeavoured in these plays to please his house.

In the first place, he made an appeal to the bourgeois taste for the mediæval romance in such plays as "The Foure Prentises of London." This play is especially noteworthy for the wild improbabilities and strange wonders that are enacted on the stage. The love of brave knights and fair ladies, of battle and strange adventure, is satisfied to the full.

The same love of adventure by land and sea motivates "The Faire Maid of the West," "Dicke of Devonshire," and the sub-plot of "The Tryall of Chevalry," in which we are concerned with Dick Bowyer's life. There is, however, more realism in these stories; Bess Bridges had her prototypes in women of the day, and Dicke of Devonshire was an actual person, whose account of his own adventures formed the basis of those sections of the play that dealt with him. The dramatist, therefore, is dealing with national and local celebrities, people who actually lived among the citizens and were of them. The expedition to Fayal and Cadiz were expeditions that took place within the memory of those in the theatre. Needless to say, this gave the plays every appearance of versimilitude, and a bourgeois audience likes its romance and adventure to be salted with truth, especially when that truth tends to satisfy national and civic pride.

The same appeal to the love of realism is made in the romances, into which, as in "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject," sub-plots containing vivid pictures of city life and manners are thrust, though they bear little or no relation to the rest of the play. And, of course, the comedy is always English comedy, with the clown of the early drama ever present, making his bad jokes and using his vulgar language.

Of all Heywood's clowns, Clem is without doubt the most amusing, and the vulgarity of the situation in which he finds himself, when elected eunuch at the court of Fesse (Fez), illustrates admirably the sort of jest the citizens liked, and the way in which Heywood was willing to pander to their coarse tastes. Heywood, I believe, rather revelled in such vulgar scenes, and succeeded in making them very amusing without making them offensive. For at heart he is a clean-minded writer. He calls a spade a spade, but never is suggestive in

a nasty way. In fact he is a moralist by nature, as in the scene cited from "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject," in which he inveighs against bawds and bawdy-houses. He extols and assails vice, and always makes virtue triumphant over evil. This, too, is to the taste of the bourgeoisie.

Finally, his sentiment is of the sort that the ordinary citizen would appreciate. There is genuine humanity in the best of his work, a humanity which will be better appreciated after a study of the class of dramas that still lies before us, for in "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" and "The English Traveller" it finds its fullest and best expression.

DRAMAS OF CONTEMPORARY LIFE

"There can be little doubt," writes Schelling, "that Heywood's strength as a dramatist lies in his powerful realization of scenes of every-day life and in the portrayal of the deeper and more serious emotions which he wrought out of the relations of domestic life."¹

Even in the plays that have hitherto been considered, this statement, I believe, has been found to be true. The big scenes in "Edward IV" are those which deal with Hobs, the tanner of Tamworth, essentially realistic pictures of country life and manners, or with Jane Shore, in the narration of whose story realism and the emotion aroused by a tragedy of domestic life go hand in hand. In the mythological series, again, the most vivid and typical scenes are those in which the classical stories are most thoroughly vulgarized, as, for example, the scene in which Jupiter and Mercury as peddlers enter Danae's tower. "The Rape of Lucrece," on the other hand, gives us, like "Edward IV," a touching story, the story of the rape itself, closely akin to domestic tragedy and full of a real pathos, which, unfortunately, the coarse comedy scenes of the rest of the play tend to destroy. The realism, finally, of many scenes in "The Faire Maid of the West" and the other romantic dramas bears even more weighty witness to Heywood's "powerful realization of every-day life"; but it is in the plays that still remain to be studied that the qualities cited by Schelling most fully reveal themselves.

Absolutely the best Elizabethan drama of its kind is "The Woman Kilde with Kindnesse," the play on which especially rests Heywood's fame as a dramatist. It is on the basis of this dramatic work that Heywood has been almost universally regarded as the father of domestic tragedy; although, of course, it must be admitted that Heywood's domestic tragedy had its source in still earlier Elizabethan plays, such as "Arden of Feversham" (1592), "A Warning for Fair Women" (1599), and other similar murder-plays, dealing with actual

¹ Schelling, "Elizabethan Drama," Vol. I, p. 336.

contemporary events.¹ These plays are, indeed, domestic tragedies of a kind, since they contain simple direct accounts of tragic occurrences in the homes of ordinary citizens, but Heywood's play, it must be noted, is different in that it is not a murder-play. It does not deal with a contemporary event which has stirred the community—the story in all probability is derived from Marguerite de Valois through Painter²—but is nevertheless contemporary in that it introduces us to a typical middle-class household and reveals to us the tragic working of “the eternal triangle” therein. In other words, though of the same general type as its predecessors, it goes far beyond them in that it is not a mere journalistic reproduction of a story already familiar to the audience through ballad or brochure, but is rather an attempt to present on the stage a domestic problem, supplying therewith a solution, that of infinite forgiveness and final repentance, which to people of the age must have been most unusual. The full force of this differentiation will, I think, be felt after some study of the drama in question.

“A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse” was first published in 1607, with prologue and epilogue but no dedication. A third edition, that of 1617, also remains to us, the second edition having, apparently, been irretrievably lost. The date of composition can be fairly accurately estimated from certain entries in “Henslowe's Diary”³ and has been set at 1602-3, when Heywood was with Worcester's men, who late in 1603 became Queen Anne's Company, acting at the Curtain Theatre.⁴

The sources of the play are less easily established. The more important of the two plots of which it is composed, is that from which it gets its title, the story of Frankford, his wife, Anne, and the false friend, Wendoll. Frankford is a

¹ A full study of the genesis and development of the domestic tragedy will be found in H. W. Singer's “Das Buergerliche Trauerspiel in England (bis zum jahre 1800),” (Leipzig, 1881).

² *Vide* pp. 103-4 of the thesis.

³ “Henslowe's Diary”—“pd at the appoyntment of the company the 12 of February, 1602, unto thomas Hewwod in pt of payment for his playe called a woman kyllled with kindnesse the some of 111,” and again on March 6, 1602, “in fulle payment” of the same 111¹ Paid Feb. 5 and Mar. 7 for properties £ 7·3 (*vide* Greg, “Henslowe's Diary,” Vol. II, p. 234).

⁴ J. Tucker Murray, “English Dramatic Companies,” Vol. I, p. 185.

wealthy land-holder, not of the nobility but one of the better class country-gentry. He marries Anne Acton, sister of Sir Francis Acton, and for a while is very happy in his home, proud of his estate and of his fair, chaste and loving wife. To Wendoll, "though of small meanes, yet a gentleman,"¹ he offers the hospitality of his house, treating him as if he were indeed one of the family. Wendoll, though he fights hard against temptation, realizing the base ingratitude of it all, falls in love with Anne, and finally, since she is weak by nature, seduces her in her husband's absence. Soon the servants begin to suspect what is happening, and Nicholas, a trusty serving-man long attached to Frankford, reports the matter to Frankford, running the risk of dismissal thereby. Frankford refuses to believe him until he has obtained ocular proof of her infidelity. His suspicions are increased by the behaviour of Anne and Wendoll during a card game, and, feigning sickness, he arranges with Nicholas a means to trap his wife. Pursuing his plan, he has new keys made to all the doors in the house and by means of a letter, which he has himself written and which Nicholas delivers, pretends he has been called from home, thus leaving Wendoll and Anne to their own devices. Frankford does not, however, travel far, but coming back to the house discovers his wife and her lover "*flagrante delicto*." With drawn sword he runs after Wendoll, but a serving-maid "stayes his hand," and the traitor escapes, Frankford thanking the maid for saving him from the sin of bloodshed. Upbraiding Anne for her shamelessness and pointing out to her the effect of her sin on the fair name of their children, Frankford as a punishment sends her away from his house to a country manor, determined to remove from his sight and memory all that may suggest his past life with her. The punishment is too much for Anne. She is overcome by her husband's magnanimity and by remorse for her own infidelity, and refuses food and drink. The news that she is on her death bed and wishes to see him once more brings Frankford to her, and he finally forgives her and weds her a second time with a kiss. Thus she dies happily, once more his wife, and on her grave is carved, "Heere lies she whom her husband's kindnesse killed."

¹ "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 103).

Koeppel¹ makes the interesting suggestion that the source of this plot is to be found in Painter's "Palace of Pleasure," Part I, novel 58, the argument of which runs as follows: "A President of Grenoble, advertised of the ill-government of his wife, took such order that his honesty was not diminished and yet revenged the facte." This tale, he points out, Painter has taken directly from the "Heptameron" of Marguerite de Valois (IV, novella 6). The likenesses which exist between the story of the "President of Grenoble" and the main plot of "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" stated briefly are: that in both (1) a husband is newly married to his wife, (2) a young man—in Painter's story a clerk—trusted implicitly by the husband has an intrigue with his wife, (3) a faithful old servant reveals the true state of affairs to his master, (4) the clerk of the novella is called Nicholas, the name of Heywood's servant. There is a certain value in these coincidences, but after all the novella has an entirely different spirit behind it, for it ends with the injured husband's revenge on his false wife. Taking every precaution, first of all to divert suspicion from himself, he finally poisons her food, and killing her thus saves the honour of his house. What a contrast there is in this to the gentleness of Heywood's hero, Frankford, who by his very kindness kills his wife, since she dies of remorse!

Martin,² augmenting Koeppel's discovery, asserts that another novel in the "Palace of Pleasure," Part I (Nov. 43), the history of a fair lady of Turin, may be regarded as a new source for Heywood's main plot. In this again we have an old husband and a young wife. The lady becomes enamoured of a young gentleman on a neighbouring estate and is seduced by him. Once more the servants become suspicious and their suspicions are conveyed to their master. He invites his neighbour to visit him, begging him to use "the things of my house as they were your owne." At one of these visits he feigns sickness, and, watching his wife and the gentleman in a garden below from his window, becomes convinced of their liaison. Shortly after he invites the gentleman

¹ Koeppel, "Quellen studien zu dem dramen Ben Jonson's, etc." (Muenchener Beitrage XI, pp. 135-36.)

² R. C. Martin, "A New Source for 'A Woman Kilde with Kindness'" ("Englische Studien," 43, pp. 229-33).

to dinner, has a bogus letter summoning him away brought to him during the meal, and pretending to ride off returns to his house to discover the lovers together in his wife's chamber. The punishment which he metes out to the offenders is signal. Calling in his servants, he makes public his wife's shame. This done, he condemns his wife and an old woman-servant, who had been an accomplice in the intrigue, to hang with their own hands the unfortunate lover. Then he orders to be burned all the furnishings of the room in which they had enjoyed their illicit love, and finally immures his false wife there with her lover's dead body, leaving only one small orifice in the walls, through which she is to receive bread and water daily. As a result of her close confinement in such dismal surroundings she soon dies.

Once more two resemblances between Painter's tale and "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" are significant, and Martin is perhaps right in believing the main plot to be a blending of the two novellae. The new elements, however, of tenderness on the part of the husband and deep repentance on the part of the wife, are Heywood's own.

The sub-plot, which is reminiscent of "Measure for Measure," is much less striking. Of the tragi-comedy type, it is based, as Symonds¹ first pointed out, on the 1611 novella of Bernardo Lapini surnamed Illicini. Illicini's novel, as Koeppel² notes, is included in Painter's "Palace of Pleasure,"³ in the story of the Sienese gentleman, Anselmo Salimbene, who, delivering his enemy from prison, is treated by him much as Acton is treated by Mountford and Susan. Painter got his story, it has been discovered, from Bandello (I, 46) through Belleforest, and Heywood may also have read it in Fenton's "Tragicall Discourses," where it also appears.

A brief analysis of the sub-plot will show its nature. Sir Francis Acton and Sir Charles Mountford are present at the wedding of Frankford to Acton's sister, Anne. Seeking amusement, they wager on the relative excellence of their

¹ J. A. Symonds, "Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama" (London 1884), p. 462, and "On the Relations of Painter's 'Palace of Pleasure' to the English Romantic Drama" ("Fortnightly Review," 1891, Vol. LVI, p. 242). For a summary of Illicini's novel see "Renaissance in Italy," Vol. V, p. 94.

² "Quellen Studien," pp. 136-37.

³ Part II, novel 30.

hawks and their hounds. In an extremely realistic hawking scene Mountford's hawk seems to prove itself the superior, but Acton refuses to accept defeat and a quarrel ensues. Words soon change into blows, and in the *mêlée* between the supporters of Acton and those of Mountford two of Acton's attendants are killed, and all flee but Mountford, who in an extremely pious and moralizing fashion prays God's forgiveness for having shed blood. His sister, appearing on the scene, hears of the affray and urges her brother to flee, but Mountford bravely prepares to face things out rather than leave his country and patrimony. Arrested at the instance of Acton, he is imprisoned and finally freed, although the expenses of the court proceedings swallow up his revenues, save his father's house and a paltry £500. A neighbour, Shafton, who has long cast envious eyes on his estate, now offers him a loan of £300 in order to get a hold on him, and Mountford, accepting it and failing to pay up in time, is once more carried off to prison and his estate confiscated. Acton, overjoyed at this ill turn of fortune to his foe, determines to complete his humiliation by seducing Susan, but on seeing Susan falls deeply in love with her. Susan appeals to all of her relatives for aid for her brother, but, as in the case of the captain in "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject," poverty gets no sympathy, for they all refuse to help her, blaming Charles Mountford for his own misfortunes, and disclaiming further kinship with him. Acton at this point tempts Susan with gold, which he sends her by Malby, his associate, but she spurns his offer; "my honour never shall for gaine be sold."¹ Her nobility of character and her beauty have by now so won Acton's heart that he determines in her to bury all his hate of her brother, and paying Mountford's debts obtains his release from prison. The news reaches Mountford while Susan is visiting him in gaol, and learning who is his benefactor and why he has proved so strangely generous, he determines to even the debt by giving over his sister to his enemy. He communicates his plan to Susan, and she agrees to go through with it, although she is resolved to stab herself before she lose her maiden honour. However, this proves unnecessary. Acton is so won over by the conduct of Mountford and his sister, who are

¹ "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 126).

determined to pay the family debt at any cost, that he at once resolves to make Susan his bride and to be Mountford's brother and friend during life.

The merits of this sub-plot lie mainly in the realism of certain scenes which are to be found in it, and not in the action, which is full of the unnatural sentimentality of chivalric romances. Scenes like the hawking scene, the scene between Shafton and Mountford and Susan, and the prison scene are full of life and actuality. The language used is simple and direct, and the action rapid. The character of Susan, the gentle heroine, is full of nobility, and reveals that sympathy which is so characteristic of Heywood. But the sub-plot as a whole has neither the vigour nor pathos nor sincerity of the main plot.

In the first place, the realism of the main plot is marvellous. Heywood was both a Londoner and of the landed gentry, and here we have vivid pictures of the country homes that were so familiar to him. One has only to consider the opening scenes of the play to realize this. There is, first of all, the room in Frankford's house on the eve of the wedding. The quality are gathered together in the great hall to talk and to dance, to congratulate the groom and praise the bride, and, when bride and groom have left, to turn the conversation to ridicule of country dances and to wagers on the proposed sports of the following day. Meanwhile, in a yard close at hand the servants are disporting themselves, dancing to the music of Sellenger's Round and discussing the wedding guests. Like realism is to be found in scenes like that in which Wendoll, his horse in "smoaking sweate," arrives breathless at Frankford's house with news of the quarrel between Acton and Mountford, in the frequent servant scenes, and in the card scene, where Frankford's suspicions are so signally aroused. There is tense dramatic power and vividness too in the scene in which Frankford and Nicholas steal into the house to discover Anne and Wendoll asleep in each other's arms, and 'real agony in Frankford's simple "Oh! Oh!" when he first sees them so. The dramatic effect throughout is obtained by extreme simplicity of diction. There is no bombast, no straining for effect or lengthy rhetoric, but the same straightforward, forceful narrative method that characterizes "*Arden of Feversham*."

The emotional note at times verges on the sentimental, but sentimentality such as this is always acceptable to the bourgeoisie. In Frankford they have a true middle-class hero, one of themselves, for though of the landed gentry he is not of the nobility. His character, however, reveals him as truly noble. His piety, like that of Susan or Mountford in the subplot, is emphasized. Like Mountford he has a horror of shedding blood, and thanks the maid-servant when she stays his arm as he is pursuing Wendoll, for had she not done so he would have had the guilt of murder on his soul. He is generous to a fault and throws open his house and all that is in it to Wendoll. He is patient and forgiving, a truly Christian character. Again we see Heywood the moralist at work, and there is a strain of sentimentality running through all his morality. The erring wife repents a thousand-fold, and is at last forgiven all, dying with her wronged husband's kiss still on her lips. Thus divine justice is satisfied, for her sin receives its punishment, death ; but at the same time there is compensation in that she dies forgiven. Heywood has pulled at the very heart-strings of his audience, first in his picture of the grief-stricken husband, second in his picture of the penitent wife. It is the Jane Shore story once more, but told by a very much greater artist with a naturalness and restraint that almost make us forget its sentimentality.

The appeal of a drama such as this to a citizen crowd is, in the light of what has already been said, obvious. It is drawn from the life which they themselves know. It is a plain story simply told :

“ Looke for no glorious state, our muse is bent
Upon a barraine subject ; a bare sceane.”¹

It is a moral story with a middle-class hero. It is besides sentimental, and possessed of that big-hearted tenderness and humanity with which the bourgeoisie, despite their other limitations, have always been pretty generally endowed. To those who are not hypercritical or blasé this is a play that will always appeal ; to the citizen houses to whom it was addressed we know by its great popularity² that it was something new and

¹ “ A Woman Kilde with Kindness ” (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 91).

² It is mentioned or alluded to very frequently in contemporary literature, *vide* Middleton's “ The Black Book,” Fletcher's “ The Woman's Prize,” III, 4, Fletcher and Shirley's “ The Night-Walker.”

especially splendid. How the figure of the forgiving avenger, Frankford, must have carried them off their feet with enthusiasm after a long line of the bloodthirsty Senecan avengers, to whom they had become accustomed. Heywood's instinct as a playwright never seems to have failed him when it came to gauging the tastes of his crowd.

Very similar in its main plot to "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" is "The English Traveller," first published in 1633, as "publikely acted at the Cock-Pit in Dury-lane by Her Maiesties servants." Queen Anne's Players were at the Cockpit from 1617 to about 1619,¹ while Queen Henrietta's Company was there from 1625 to February, 1637, when the theatre appears to have been taken over by Beeston's Boys.² The play seems to have been written for Queen Henrietta's servants; for the scene in Act II, in which young Lionell and his fellow revellers in their drunkenness believe themselves on board a ship in a high sea, is probably based on a translation by John Molle of a like scene in the ninety-fourth chapter of Philip Camerarius' "Operae Horarum Subscisivarum sine Meditationes Historiae." This translation, as will be noted, was published in 1621 by Adam Islip, who also published in 1626 Heywood's "Gynaikeion."³ The play must therefore have been written both after 1621 and when "her Maiesties servants" were at the Cockpit, hence after 1625. Fleay is inclined to set the date about 1627,⁴ Aronstein soon after 1625.⁵

The sources of the main plot are unknown, though Heywood in the 1657 edition of his "History of Women"⁶ asserts that the Geraldine story is actual fact. Fleay, on this basis, says that Geraldine must have been a well-known traveller, and adds that he believes he was George Sandys, whose travels in Palestine, Turkey, Italy and Greece were published in 1610.⁷

¹ J. Tucker Murray, "English Dramatic Companies," Vol. I, p. 195.

² *Ibid.*, p. 266.

³ W. Bang and H. de Vocht, "Klassiker and Humanisten als quellen 'Alterer Dramatiker,'" Englische Studien, Vol. 26, pp. 389-90. This also shows how the incident was originally derived from Athenaios "Deipnosoph," lib. ii, 5 (*vide* also Herford, "Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century," p. 372, footnote).

⁴ Fleay, "Biog. Chron. of English Drama," Vol. I, p. 297.

⁵ Anglia, 37, p. 240.

⁶ "History of Women" (Edition of 1657), pp. 268-71.

⁷ Fleay, "Biog. Chron. of English Drama," Vol. I, p. 295.

However, this after all is mere surmise. The source of the sub-plot is without question the "*Mostellaria*" of Plautus.¹

It is in the main plot of the drama that its chief interest lies, and a short analysis of this will show the general similarity to that of "*A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*." Young Geraldine, the English traveller, has just returned to England after a long trip abroad. During his absence an old neighbour, Wincott, has married a young girl, with whom prior to his departure on his journeys young Geraldine had been in love. Old Wincott, an honest burgher, takes a great fancy to the young man, his neighbour's son and a cultured gentleman and traveller, and, purposing to make him his heir, entertains him very frequently at his house. Young Geraldine, indeed, is practically one of Wincott's own family, so often visiting him that his own father sees him less often than he would have wished. When alone together, the young man, who is portrayed as the soul of honour, and Wincott's wife agree to remain merely very good friends until Wincott's death—and Geraldine wishes him a "*Nestor's age*"—when they will be free to marry one another.

With Geraldine on his visits to old Wincott is Dalavill, his best friend, whom he trusts implicitly. Dalavill, however, like Wendoll, does not merit such trust, and seduces Wincott's wife. To cover his guilt he insinuates to Geraldine's father that the young man is far too frequent a visitor at Wincott's home, and that people are beginning to talk about his affair with the mistress of the house. Old Geraldine is very much moved, and charges his son with base ingratitude and adultery, but his son, answering him in a straightforward manly fashion, convinces his father, who has promised to say nothing of Dalavill's part in the matter, that there is absolutely no truth in any of the rumours. To dispel slanderous reports, however, he agrees to cease his visits to Wincott.

Wincott now feels hurt that his young friend, for whom he has such real affection, is obviously trying to avoid him, and desires an explanation. Meanwhile Bess, a serving-maid in Wincott's home, meeting young Geraldine by chance, tells him

¹ The best treatment of this relation between the "*Mostellaria*" and "*The English Travellers*" is to be found in A. H. Gilbert's "*Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus*" ("*Journ. Eng. and Germ. Philology*," 12).

her suspicions of Dalavill and her mistress. Geraldine refuses to believe them :

“ Shee a Prostitute ?
Nay, and to him my troath plight, and my friend ;
As possible it is, that Heaven and Earth
Should be in love together, meet and kisse,
And so cut off all distance ; what strange frensie
Came in this wenches braine, so to surmise ? ”¹

Receiving a letter from Wincott, reproving him for his long absence, he arranges a private meeting at the old man's house, at which he explains to him the reasons for his behaviour. Old Wincott accepts the explanation gladly, and insists that Geraldine remain with him over night. Bidding him good-night, Wincott then goes off to his room. But Geraldine cannot sleep, for he does not want to run the risk of not waking early enough to get away before the rest of the household know of his visit. There is no book in the room for him to read ; no way to pass the time ; and his thoughts naturally turn to the lady. He decides to see her before he goes, and makes his way toward her chamber, for he knows Wincott is asleep in another room. Outside her door he listens for her voice and is surprised to hear two voices—hers and that of Dalavill. Bess' charges against her mistress are proved without a shadow of doubt.

At first Geraldine is about to run into the chamber and kill them both, but, fortunately, he has left his sword in his chamber. This prevents him “ from playing a base Hang-man ”² and shedding blood, for which he thanks heaven. He then resolves to say nothing, and disillusioned in his love determines to take to travel once more. Despite the efforts of his father to dissuade him, he sticks to his resolution, and Wincott gives a farewell dinner in his honour. Dalavill's fears on this occasion are aroused by Geraldine's coldness towards him, and Wincott's wife, trying the young traveller's endurance beyond all bounds by her hypocritical grief at his departure, is denounced by him as an adulteress. Realizing that all is discovered she falls in a faint, from which Dalavill revives her, only to be called Devil for his pains. Her repentance, if it can really be called such, is rapid and unconvincing. Carried to her chamber, she dies

¹ “ The English Traveller ” (Pearson Ed., Vol. IV, p. 57).

² *Ibid.* (Pearson Ed., Vol. IV, p. 70).

of the shock she has undergone, and Dalavill gallops off in the general confusion of the household. Young Geraldine, of course, is praised for his virtue, created Wincott's heir, and determines to remain in England.

As in "*A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*," we have in this story of bourgeois life vivid pictures of a prosperous middle-class home and its family life. There is the same realism in these pictures, which are pictures now not of the country but of the town, as characterized the other and, I believe, greater play. In addition, we have the same array of bourgeois characters, the generous husband who entertains the false friend, the erring wife, and the suspicious servants who first reveal the intrigue. But the stress here is laid not so much on the husband, estimable as he is, as on the true friend upon whom the villain of the play tries to cast suspicion. He, too, is a citizen of the well-to-do class, cultured, travelled, a good son and a noble Christian character. His piety and his self-control are emphasized. He is the young citizen as he should be. Again we have that moral strain that marks the best of Heywood's work.

The tone of the whole narrative is sentimental, but it lacks the conviction of "*A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*." It is a simple tale simply told, but yet it lacks the power of the earlier work. Still, it rings infinitely more true than the romantic tragi-comedies, based on novellae, as, for instance, that in the sub-plot of "*A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*," for we are dealing here with characters of real flesh and blood, men and women who for the most part act and speak in a really human way, not mere lay figures thrust headlong into a complex and tangled story like pieces in a game.

The sub-plot is inserted for the sake of variety. Heywood apparently felt that pure tragedy would not please his crowd. Tragedy, unrelieved by any lighter elements, could have been appreciated and enjoyed by an aristocratic audience, but was not to the taste of those who frequented the Cockpit. Hence the dramatist binds up loosely with his serious plot a comic plot taken wholesale from Plautus.

Old Lionell, a merchant, has left England on business. His son, young Lionell, who is left at home, wastes in prodigality the money left him by his father, and makes his father's house the scene of wild revels with his evil acquaintances. His

able assistant in this course of debauchery is Reignald, a parasitical serving-man, long in his father's service. Robin, a country serving-man, alone raises his voice in protest at his extravagance.

Young Lionell finally arranges a great dinner, at which are present Blanda, his mistress, and all the rioters of the city of whom Reignald can get hold. It is at this banquet that the scene derived from *Camerarius* is described. The rioters get very tipsy, and imagine the rocking floor is the deck of a ship. They throw out all the furniture to lighten the vessel through the storm, and when the constables enter to take them away take them for Neptune and his tritons, a glorious bit of comic narrative for the edification of the groundlings.¹ It is to be noted that this scene is not actually staged, but is described with remarkable realism in the course of a conversation between the characters of the more serious plot, Geraldine, Wincott, Dalavill and the wife. Thus the comic elements are introduced into the body of the domestic tragedy itself. This shows how Heywood wrote specifically for his audience ; for while another dramatist probably would have avoided any such intrusion into his tragedy, Heywood seeks in every way to give it increased variety and appeal.

It is on the morning after the revel that Reignald comes to young Lionell with the bad news that his father has landed unexpectedly, and is on his way to the house. Like the clever slave of the Latin comedies, Reignald now sets about trying to dupe his old master in order to protect his dissolute young master. He tells old Lionell the house is haunted by the ghost of a former tenant murdered in it.

From this point the sub-plot is of the purely classical type. The cunning servant gets into still further difficulties by his many devices until the final *dénouement*, when, of course, the father forgives all and the son determines to turn over a new leaf. The situations are amusing, the comedy broad and farcical. A clown, who appears in both main plot and sub-plot, makes his rather ineffective and laboured jokes. It is simply Plautus with native elements—the clown for example—thrown in to give the Latin version added piquancy.

¹ It is to be noted that even the idea of the constables as Neptune and the Tritons comes from Heywood's source.

The scene is laid in England and the characters are of the English citizen type. Again, as in "The Captives," Latin comedy has been modernized for the popular English stage.

"Fortune by Land and Sea," published in 1655 after Heywood's death, was written in conjunction with William Rowley, who in 1610 was a member of the Duke of York's Company.¹ Fleay² is responsible for the further statement that Rowley from 1607-9 was a member of Queen Anne's Company, to which Heywood then belonged, though his evidence of this is somewhat questionable.³ If this were so, however, it would enable us to date "Fortune by Land and Sea" within the years 1607-9, a date which Aronstein⁴ attempts to corroborate by echoes from "Macbeth" and "Henry IV." Fleay adds that in 1609 "the public were excited about pirates," referring as proof of this to "The Christian Turned Turk" by Daborne, entered in the Stationers' Register, February, 1611, and based on a prose account by Andrew Barker (Stationers' Register, 24 October, 1609). Even had Rowley not been a member of Queen Anne's Company at this time, there is nothing to have prevented him collaborating during these years with Heywood, and the evidence submitted leads me to believe 1607-9 fairly close to the actual date of composition of the play.

The stories, that of young Forrest and that of the Harding family, are woven together, but these stories are more closely connected with each other than is often the case in Heywood. For Susan Forrest, Forrest's sister, is married to Philip Harding, the hero of the Harding tale, while old Harding's wife, Anne, proves the friend in distress of young Forrest when he is in flight, and on her husband's death becomes the wife of the erstwhile fugitive. Thus the two plots, in part at least, are essential to each other; each separately would have made a play, but as they stand in this drama each aids in the development of the action of the other. Perhaps, though this is by no means certain, the ingenious devices by which the plots are

¹ J. Tucker Murray, "English Dramatic Companies," Vol. I, p. 231, and "Shakespeare Soc. Pub.," IV, 47.

² Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. I, p. 296, "Chronicle History of Stage," p. 375.

³ J. Tucker Murray, "English Dramatic Companies," Vol. I, p. 231.

⁴ Anglia, 37, p. 237.

inter-related may be ascribed to Rowley. At any rate it is exceedingly difficult to tell just where we find Rowley's work and where Heywood's. Ward¹ is inclined to consider "the rough strength" of certain passages in the first act indicative of Rowley; Aronstein² to ascribe to Heywood the domestic drama of the Harding scenes. My own study of the play leads me to believe that the scenes in the first act concerned with the Forrest story and the first scene of the last act, are probably Rowley's; the remainder and bulk of the play being the work of Heywood.³

There is only one known possible source, the source for the pirate section in the Forrest plot. This is based probably on the verse-account of the pirates Clinton, Thomas Walton alias Purser, and Arnold (Stationers' Register, Aug. 15, 1586),⁴ and contains sea-scenes reminiscent of Heywood's subject-matter and manner in "The Faire Maid of the West," being at once realistic and romantic with a real tang of the salt.

The opening scenes of the play are full of vigorous contemporary life. Frank Forrest, brother of the hero of the Forrest story, is urged by his father not to spend so much of his time with his dissolute companions, Raynsforth, Goodwin and Foster, since he can neither afford the time nor the money to do so. But Frank is headstrong, and against his father's orders decides to sup with them in a London tavern. On the evening of the supper Raynsforth is unnaturally gloomy, and when Frank arrives, by casting ridicule on old Forrest, picks a quarrel with the young man, who, whatever be his other vices, is true-hearted and loyal to his own family. Raynsforth flings wine in Frank's face, swords are drawn, there is a quick scuffle, Frank is killed, and Raynsforth takes to flight.

The scene is not unlike those in the tavern kept by Bess Bridges at Foy. There are the same scurrying drawers; the same shouts for wine; the same swash-buckling diners.

¹ Ward, "English Dramatic Literature," Vol. II, p. 569.

² Aronstein, "Anglia," 37, pp. 237-38.

³ Bearing in mind the fact that Rowley wrote notoriously unpolished blank verse, an examination of the whole play at once indicates that Act I, Scs. ii and iv, and Act V, Sc. i, are by him. Act I, Sc. i, contains one passage of blank verse that suggests Heywood—old Forrest's first speech, "Nay Gentlemen" and ff—but the rest reads more like Rowley.

⁴ "Shakespeare Society Papers," iii, 2.

To the realism of the scene is added pathos when old Forrest and his daughter rush in, and pick up the young man's body. For a brief while the father is so overcome with grief that he goes out of his wits, and begins to talk incoherently, but he recovers in time to explain the state of affairs to young Forrest, brother to Frank, who now enters. Young Forrest vows revenge on Raynsforth, and, arranging a duel with him, kills him. The deed is no sooner done than Forrest repents of his action; he has the guilt of blood on his conscience, and, as to Frankford and young Geraldine, this thought brings terror to his pious heart. However, there is no time for regrets or delay, for Goodwin and Foster are off to raise a hue and cry in the city, and he must flee for safety. Pursued by the constables, he is sheltered by Anne Harding, step-mother of his sister, and by her is given a letter to her brother, a merchant and ship-owner, and smuggled on board his vessel locked in a chest. The merchant, who thus proves his benefactor, is later captured by the pirates, Purser and Clinton; Forrest, who is now captain of a ship, comes to his rescue most opportunely, returns to the merchant his stolen cargo, and wins a big reward offered by the English government for the capture of the pirate, the Queen herself honouring him signally. Old Harding meanwhile has died, so that nothing bars Forrest's marriage to the widow, Anne. With this event this plot is concluded.

The second plot is concerned with Forrest's sister, Susan. She marries young Philip Harding, the son of a neighbour, and the match is one of which old Harding does not approve. For though Susan is all beauty and all virtue, the Forrests are an impoverished family. Thus for his foolish marriage to Susan Philip is disinherited, and becomes a mere labourer on his father's estate, serving even his own brothers, who seem none too loath to profit by his ill-fortune. Susan does her part also in the work on the estate, and the only friends the young couple have are an honest and tender-hearted clown, and Mistress Anne, the young step-mother. However, virtue triumphs in the end. Old Harding has interests in a ship, which is reported captured by pirates, the ship it may be noted of Anne's merchant-brother. The news of this loss—only a supposed loss thanks to young Forrest—is too much for him, and he dies suddenly without making his will. Philip, as the eldest son,

thus inherits his father's estate, and the play ends happily with the wicked brothers forgiven, and the noble young couple amply rewarded.

As a whole "*Fortune by Land and Sea*" contains several of the elements by which Heywood endeavoured to ingratiate his work to a bourgeois audience. Like "*A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*" and "*The English Traveller*" it deals with middle-class society, and extols bourgeois heroes for the bourgeois virtues, for their readiness to work, for their common-sense, their endurance, their frankness, and their piety. The brave young Forrest, the patient Philip, the gentle Susan are characters such as we find in all Heywood's works, and the faithful clown is, of course, to be added to this list. The characters, too, are to be found in a setting that to Heywood's audience was familiar—in taverns, in London houses, on the streets and on the docks. Their stories besides contained that element of sentimentality which we have seen marked the two plays already discussed in this section. They were simple stories, but real stories and stories that were both exciting and moving. The story of Forrest provided the romance. Beginning with a brawl in a tavern, it ran on through a series of romantic incidents. The duel, the flight, the meeting with Anne—of course everyone knew he would eventually marry her—the escape, the fight at sea with the pirates, contemporary figures already known to all through the tract of 1586, all these were scenes suited to the bourgeois love of romance. The story of Philip and Susan, on the other hand, provided the sentimentality. The rich man's son loves and marries the virtuous but poor girl. For her he is disinherited, and labours in the fields, persecuted by his unfeeling brethren. Together he and his wife suffer, but right is finally victorious, and virtue rising from poverty forgives its enemies. Realism, sentimentality, romance and sea adventure, contemporary history, and middle-class life, these are the compounds of which "*Fortune by Land and Sea*" is created, the self-same compounds which made "*The English Traveller*" and "*The Faire Maid of the West*" popular with Heywood's London crowd.

In "*The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*" and "*The Late Lancashire Witches*" we have something new. For these,

especially the latter, are based even more specifically than any plays heretofore on contemporary events, and were written to express public opinion on these events.

"The Wise Woman of Hogsdon, A Comedie" was published in 1638 with Heywood's name and motto, but no other reference on the title-page which in any way helps one to decide the date of composition or of stage production. A reference in the third act,¹ however, establishes the date as after 1603, the date of "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse," and Fleay,² seeing in the play allusions to "The Devil and his Dame," "Mother Red-cap," "Cutting Dick," "Jack Dunn," "Too Good to be True," etc., says it may probably be the lost "How to Learn of a Woman to Woo," acted, according to P. Cunningham, before the King, Dec. 30, 1604. Schelling, Koeppel, and Ward accept this date, and Aronstein has no further suggestions to offer; so that it seems fairly well approved. The sources of the play are unknown, though the leading character must have been derived from some prominent contemporary figure notorious for her witchcraft, as were Mother Bombie, Dame Sturten in Goulden Lane, Mother Phillips of the Bankeside, and others whom she herself mentions in the play.³

The plot, which deals with the matrimonial adventures of young Chartley, "a wild-headed gentleman," whose character is by no means admirable, is very complicated, and full of unusual and spicy situations. Chartley, son of the owner of a country estate, is betrothed to Luce, whom he deserts on the eve of their marriage. In London he spends his day with wild companions, drinking and gaming—the opening scene is a wonderful picture of a game at dice—and becomes interested in another Luce, the daughter of a goldsmith and the *inamorata* of Boyster, one of his boon companions. Of course, Luce is the chaste and lovely bourgeois heroine. "She hath," says Chartley, "a browe bewitching, eyes ravishing and a tongue enchanting; and indeed she hath no fault in the world but one,

¹ "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 316) (Act III, Sc. ii). "We shall have thee claim kindred of the woman killed with kindnesse."

² Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. II, pp. 291-92.

³ "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 292).

and that is, she is honest; and were't not for that she were the onely sweet rogue in Christendome."¹ Her father, too, is straightforward, dignified and worthy, the honest artisan so pleasing to Heywood's citizen audience. But, apparently, Chartley is to the fair sex irresistible, and the virtuous city-maiden accepts his court, demanding however that he marry her. Chartley agrees, and on Luce's suggestion determines to get the notorious wise woman of Hogsdon to arrange the ceremony. The country Luce, however, who has followed Chartley to London, overhears these plans, and dressing herself in boy's clothes, gets employment with the wise woman in order to frustrate her former lover, Chartley's, plans. Chartley, on his first meeting with the old woman, is drunk and insults and mocks her, so that she readily agrees to her newly-hired page's proposal that she obtain revenge on the young man by preventing his marriage to the city Luce. Thus they very cleverly bring it about that Boyster, who has come to the wise woman for help in his love-affairs, is married to the city Luce, while Chartley is tricked into marrying the country Luce—the page—without knowing what he has done.

Into the plot at this point is introduced the courtship of Sencer. He loves the daughter of Sir Henry, but the old knight refuses to accept him as suitor for his daughter's hand, promising, however, that if he ever even hires Sencer to stay with him the latter will have his consent. A glorious comedy scene very much to the taste of the vulgar crowd follows. Sir Harry wants a Latin tutor for his daughter Gratiana, and Sir Boniface, an ignorant pedant, applies for the post. A rival candidate appears in the person of Sir Timothy, Sencer in disguise. The scene that results is full of the broadest and coarsest of comedy. The Latin of Sir Boniface is fearfully mutilated and misinterpreted by Sir Timothy, whose part Fleay believes Heywood himself to have taken. "Domine cur rogas?" says Sir Boniface. "Is this indeed to be endured to call a Knight, Cur, Rogue and Asse?" asks Sencer.² The comedy of lines such as this is poor enough art, but vastly amusing to an audience that, after all, was either unlearned or at most half-learned in Latin and Greek. The discomfiture of a

¹ "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon," Act I (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 284).

² "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 321).

pedant indeed is pleasant in any society, but to the matter-of-fact merchant or artisan especially so.

Having vanquished Sir Boniface, Sencer is now established as Gratiana's tutor. But Chartley has learned of Gratiana's beauty and riches and now pays her court and is accepted. However, by means of very clever devices the Wise Woman manages to gather all the principal characters and their parents together at her house, and Chartley is finally exposed, with the happy result that Boyster and the city Luce, Chartley and the country Luce, and Sencer and Gratiana are paired off.

It will be seen that the plot is that of a typical comedy of intrigue, full of clever schemes and startling situations. But the real interest of the play lies not so much in its plot as in its treatment of the witch of Hogsdon. She is depicted with a great deal of realism as a most successful charlatan. The first scene in which she appears reveals her methods. A countryman wants to know how to treat his sick wife.

Wise Woman: And where doth the paine hold her most?

Countryman: Marry at her heart forsooth.

Wise Woman: Ay, at her heart, shee hath a griping at her heart.

Countryman: You have hit it right.

Wise Woman: Shee hath no paine in her head, hath shee?

Countryman: No, indeed, I never heard her complaine of her head.

Wise Woman: I told you so, her paine lies all at her heart. . . ."¹

And so by a series of veiled questions she impresses the countryman with her wisdom and knowledge and sends him away vastly satisfied. She has a little closet close to the door of the consultation room in which she sits and listens while her servant questions her clients as to the object of their visit, so that later she can overawe them by telling them their mission before they have ever spoken to her. She cannot read, but with the appearance of wisdom cons great books to create an impression of vast learning. In addition to being a quack, she keeps rooms in her house for immoral purposes, acts the midwife on occasion, and disposes of illegitimate children for a consideration. Though ignorant, she is possessed of low cunning, and in her own way is wise, wise enough to lose no oppor-

¹ "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 293).

tunity of turning a dishonest penny. The picture partakes of the nature of social satire. The Wise Woman is by no means an admirable character and her vices have not been glossed over. Heywood portrays her probably as most of the sensible burghers of his own day conceived all the so-called wise women in whom the peasantry and poorer artisans placed such great faith; and the bourgeoisie were only too glad to find this form of contemporary charlatanism so realistically attacked on the stage. In this, as in so much else that has already been noted, Heywood has sensed the feelings of his crowd. In its revelation of contemporary conditions the play served a moral purpose. Like Reade or Dickens, Heywood is here attacking a current abuse, an abuse too of which the middle-classes far more than the aristocracy were conscious.

"The Late Lancashire Witches," written by Heywood and Richard Brome and published in 1634, is more bitter and less amusing in its attack on witchcraft. There is no question as to the date of the play or the circumstances in which it arose, for a trial for witchcraft took place in Lancashire in 1633. The trial resulted in seventeen persons being found guilty by an ignorant and superstitious jury, but the judge postponed sentence, and four of the alleged witches were sent to London for further trial before King Charles I. On their arrival they were examined by the King's physician and were pronounced not guilty, the chief witness against them, a boy called Edward Robinson, later admitting that he had been suborned to give false evidence. A study of the prologue and epilogue¹ of the play will show that it was produced after the trial in Lancashire and before the trial in London. The latter took place in 1634, thus the play must have been written between the first trial on February 10, 1633, and the later trial in 1634.

Fleay,² Crossley,³ and Ward⁴ are inclined to think, however,

¹ "The Late Lancashire Witches" (Pearson Ed., Vol. IV, p. 262), Epilogue:

"Now while those witches must expect their due
By lawful justice we appeale to you
For favourable censure; what their crime
May bring upon 'em, ripeness yet of time
Has not reveal'd. . . ."

² Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of English Drama," Vol. I, p. 302.

³ James Crossley, Introduction to 'T. Potts' "Discovery of Witches" ("Chetham Soc. Pub.," Vol. IV, pp. 35-36).

⁴ "Cambridge History," Vol. VI, p. 118.

that the play was based, in part at least, on an account of the legal proceedings of a still earlier case, that of 1612. The account in question was written by the clerk of the court, Thomas Potts, and was published in 1613 under the title, "The Wonderful Discoverie of Witches in the Countie of Lancashire." That Heywood got ideas from this legal report—though Aronstein is inclined to question that he did¹—is quite probable, but Fleay's further contention that he wrote an earlier play on the same subject, which he and Brome later re-vamped, is scarcely proven.

As a matter of fact, both in the narrative and the names of the characters,² large sections of the play follow closely the accounts that we have of the 1633 trial. The boy, who in "The Late Lancashire Witches" is so important a witness at the trial which impends at the conclusion of the play, is Edward Robinson, the witness in the actual case, and his experiences are those which Edward swore in court that he underwent. The whole story of the bewitched hounds, and of the boy's escape from the witches gathered in the barn, is taken wholesale from the prose account. Heywood and Brome are here mere stage journalists, presenting before their audience a stage version of the case in law. Very probably they interviewed Edward Robinson himself, and got their detailed information from him direct; certainly they were resolved to avail themselves to the full of the interest which the superstitious bourgeoisie were showing in the trial. They seem to have been determined, too, to follow the crowd in their attitude towards the old women who had been accused, for they do their best to make out a bad case against them prior to their examination by the King and the Bishop of Chester. Public feeling against witches was already strong at the time, and the two authors of this drama seem to have endeavoured to make it even more bitter. Positive malignity has taken the place of the mocking satire and ridicule of "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon." Heywood obviously regarded her as a fraud, but if he was at

¹ Philip Aronstein, "Die Hexen im Englischen Renaissance Drama" *Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift*, Vol. 4, p. 594.

² The names of Heywood's witches, Dame Dickinson, Maud Hargraves, Margaret Johnson and her familiar, Mamilion, are all taken from those of the characters at the trial.

all honest—and I believe him so—he had no doubt of the evil deeds of the Pendle witches, and therefore was unsparing in his efforts to have them convicted.¹

There is no need to give a careful analysis of the play. It is full of all manner of supernatural nonsense. Witches take the form of dogs or horses at will; they travel about at breakneck speed; throw a whole household into a state of discord; interrupt a marriage feast by confounding the musicians and transforming the food; as cats, scratch the face of a terrified miller; and hold their dread meetings at midnight. The play is a series of unbelievable prodigies, which a credulous audience were only too ready to believe.

In addition, there is a vein of coarse humour running through the play. The pranks of the witches are at times quite comic in a frank crude way. The misfortunes of Lawrence on his wedding night, and the way in which Whetstone reveals to the other characters their own fathers shows this comedy in its ugliest and at the same time—to Heywood's audience—possibly most amusing form. The picture of Mrs. Generous, riding off on poor Robin, the clown, is also funny, and Whetstone himself, idiot that he is, must have delighted men naturally prone to laugh at rather than pity the weak-minded or deformed. The comedy thus is not high-class, but bourgeois comedy, rough slap-stick stuff reminiscent of the earliest English drama.

Generous and Whetstone are humour characters. His name betrays the latter no less than the former. Whetstone is indeed the whetstone for the wit of those with whom he is cast, while Generous in no way belies his name. Doughty and Bantam are other possible instances of the same thing. The fact that Richard Brome was at one time a servant and always a follower of Jonson points to him as responsible for this side of the play.

There are two main plots, that of Generous and his wife, and that of the misadventures in the Seeley family. Of these the former is the more striking, in that it reminds us of the

¹ It may be said in partial exoneration of Heywood that the sections of the play which can be ascribed to Brome are on the whole more severe in their attack on witchcraft, but of Heywood's own feeling against the witches there appears to me to be little doubt. The section on witches in the "*Gunaikeion*" gives additional evidence of his attitude.

domestic tragedy, as we found it, in "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" and "The English Traveller." The wife of Generous after a series of strange occurrences in which she is involved is suspected of being a witch. Eventually she confesses her guilt to her husband, who generously forgives her, provided she will make amends. But, apparently, she cannot redeem herself, for she soon goes back to her old ways and to her leadership of the witches. Discovered by her husband, he now realizes that the only thing that he can do is to hand her over to the proper authorities. There is sincere pathos in the treatment of the distressed husband, which indicates that whatever else in this play Heywood did not write, this story at least is his work. It very distinctly borders on the domestic tragedy, and contains some emotional passages which attain real distinction.

The other plot is pure farce comedy and may perhaps be attributed very largely to Brome. The situations in it are grotesquely humorous; parents are under the thumb of their children, the children subject to the whims of a pair of ignorant servants, whose dialect is good broad Lancashire—another argument for Brome's authorship.¹ The picture is that of a household turned topsy-turvey by witchcraft, amusing enough, but scarcely high comedy.

Thus in "The Late Lancashire Witches" we have an evident catering to popular tastes. The play is bourgeois in its journalistic and sensational elements; in its propaganda against the black arts; in its coarse farce-comedy; and in its presentation of sentimental tragedy drawn from middle-class life. It is only in the last that it rises above comparative mediocrity; there Heywood's genius found matter that was properly suited to it.

It is hard to say what one should think of "The Fayre Mayde of the Exchange," of which, in 1671, Francis Kirkman,² the London bookseller, declared Heywood to be the author, for in many ways it seems hardly possible that this play can be Heywood's. It is the bourgeois elements in the play, aside from the similarity of its title to that of "The Faire Maid of the West," that have been the main reasons for its inclusion in

¹ The Lancashire Dialect is used in Brome's "Northern Lass."

² "Dict. National Biography," Vol. XXXI, pp. 215-20.

editions of Heywood's plays. There are in it the varied bourgeois characters that Heywood so often portrayed, the cripple, Phyllis, old Flower, Bowdler, Mall Berry, and the other London citizens. The scene is laid in the city, and a fairly lively picture of city life is given us. The comedy is a comedy of intrigue like that in "*The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*," containing certain more vulgar elements for the edification of the bourgeoisie. The sentimentality of the love-affair between Phyllis and the noble cripple falls in line with the sentimentality in the best of Heywood's domestic dramas. One would like to think, indeed, that it was actually the tender-hearted Heywood who strove, in the person of the cripple, to show how a noble spirit may be lodged in a crooked body, for this is without question the sort of subject that appealed to him. If he did write the play, it can be seen thus that in it as elsewhere he was writing for the London populace.

Langbaine, Ward, Schelling, Aronstein and Fleay, however, unite in doubting his authorship, the last named being inclined¹ to ascribe it to Lewis Machin. The generally accepted date of composition is 1601-2, so that the play is contemporaneous with "*The Faire Maid of the West*" (1600-3), "*The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*" (1603), and "*A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*" (1603). A contrast between any one of these plays and "*The Fayre Mayde of the Exchange*," will reveal, I believe, either the fact that Heywood was very much below his best when he wrote the "delectable" comedy of the "fayre mayde" and the cripple of Fanchurch, or that the play was the work of a younger artist, an imitator, inspired probably by the tremendous success of "*The Faire Maid of the West*." In my opinion the latter is the case; Fleay's arguments against Heywood's authorship and my own investigations have led me to this conclusion. It is poorly constructed, lacks Heywood's easy manner, is full of rhymed lines though written at a time when Heywood was writing his best blank verse, and, despite Charles Lamb's praise of the characterization of the cripple and the dramatic presentation of the cripple's story, is unconvincing even in its most sentimental scenes.

Not much more can be said regarding "*How a Man May*

¹ Fleay, "*Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*," Vol. II, pp. 239-330.

Choose a Good Wife from a Bad," published 1602 and acted "sundry times" by the Earl of Worcester's Servants. This play is attributed, by an insertion on the title page, to Joshua Cooke, but Fleay,¹ on the basis of certain similarities in Latin phrases to "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon," ascribes it to Heywood. Ward,² however, believes the name Joshua Cooke may have been a mistake for John Cooke, the author of the play "Greene's Tu Quoque," and thus the matter stands. The plot, that of a foolish and prodigal husband, who leaves his faithful wife to follow after an unscrupulous courtesan, only to be happily reunited to her finally, has in it the sentimental elements that so appealed to Heywood, and, as in the years 1601-3 he was with Worcester's Men, it is just possible that this may have been one of the 220 plays in which he claims to have had a "main finger." This would explain the similarities to "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon," and yet concede to Cooke the larger part of the authorship of the play, which in tone seems too crude to be entirely Heywood's. The clownish servant, Pipkin, the pedantic Latinisms of Sir Aminadab, the coarse humour of the comic sections, and the fact that a domestic tragi-comedy constitutes the main plot, give the drama a distinctly bourgeois tone, but whether Heywood or Cooke was responsible for this it is, of course, impossible to tell.

✓ We have thus concluded our study of the dramas, which for the sake of convenience we have called dramas of contemporary life. To summarize very briefly the bourgeois elements already noted therein, one may remark first of all
 ① their intense realism. All of them, the domestic tragedies and the satirical and journalist comedies of witchcraft, are alike in that they portray citizen life and activity with intense vividness. We have scenes in the country houses of the landed gentry and scenes in their kitchens, scenes in London homes and on the London streets, scenes of merchants or of artisans or farmers full of the vigour that comes from close acquaintance and careful observation. Heywood in a way is like the Dutch genre painters, painting bourgeois life with a bourgeois joy in it.

② Secondly, we have in these plays of contemporary life,

¹ Fleay, "Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama," Vol. I, p. 290.

² Ward, "English Dramatic Literature," Vol. II, pp. 608-9.

bourgeois morality, a morality not unmixed with sentimentality. The virtuous husband is represented as facing a difficult domestic problem; the noble son as bearing patiently the oppression of a stern father or unfeeling brethren; and in the end, of course, goodness conquers evil, and the sinners are punished while the righteous reap their just reward.

Thirdly, the plays are full of coarse bourgeois humour. The clown of native English comedy is always present, and his jests are not for the squeamish. It is a frank humour rather than a nasty humour, but its frankness scarcely makes it very savoury to a more sophisticated and cultured audience than that for which it was intended.

Finally, there is in "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon" bourgeois satire; an attack on an evil which the bourgeoisie better than the aristocracy realized. In "The Late Lancashire Witches," on the other hand, there is an attempt on the part of the dramatists to take advantage of popular interest in current events and to play on popular superstitions. The spirit which motivates the attack on witchcraft is derived by the dramatists from their sympathy with the attitude of the citizens for whom they wrote.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BOURGEOIS ELEMENTS IN THE PLAYS

There are no more extant plays, which can with any certainty be ascribed to Heywood, although he himself claims to have had a hand in no less than some two hundred and twenty dramas. There can be no doubt of his industry. Francis Kirkman, the bookseller, asserts that he made it a rule to write a minimum of a sheet a day for many years, and that he wrote in extreme haste, often in taverns on the back of inn-reckonings. Whether this be an exaggerated statement or not, his long connection with the theatre—in 1633 he had been actor and playwright for at least thirty-seven years—must have given him plenty of time and opportunity for extensive composition for the stage.

Much of his work must have been, of course, pure hack-work, the patching up of old plays for a new performance, the reading and emendation of manuscripts submitted for presentation by prentice playwrights, the adaptation, as in "The Late Lancashire Witches," of matter of current interest for stage purposes. In all such plays clearly he could claim to have had a main finger, but still one dare not believe that the bulk of the 220 dramas consisted of plays of this sort. In fact we do know from entries in "Henslowe's Diary" the names of several lost plays, which must have been wholly his, and that they, along with many others, are lost is to be attributed to the fact that Heywood wrote primarily for the theatre and not for the press. Thus much of his work was never printed and will never be re-discovered. We are forced, therefore, to judge him entirely on the basis of the plays that we have at hand, and from them to estimate the nature and scope of his work.

So far then we have considered these plays individually, and endeavoured to point out the bourgeois elements in each of them. It is necessary before closing this study, even at the risk of frequent repetitions, to summarize clearly the results so obtained, relating them to each other in such a way as to show how consistently throughout his work Heywood fashioned his

material with the limitations and tastes of his audience in mind.

In general, he shows a tendency to follow his sources very closely. This is particularly noticeable in "Edward IV," "The Rape of Lucrece," "The Captives," and "The Late Lancashire Witches." In "The Captives," written—if we can judge by the state of what seems to be an autographic manuscript—in extreme haste, convenience, perhaps, more than anything else, dictated the dramatist's policy in keeping close to the "Rudens." It is so much easier to write quickly when all one's action and most of one's dialogue has already been done by another. In the three other plays, however, the will of the public must have influenced Heywood. For the reign of "Edward IV" there were accepted authorities in Holinshed and his fellow-chroniclers, for early Roman history in Livy, and for the story of the trial of the famous Lancashire witches of 1633 in the reports of the court proceedings. Any deviation from these authorities on the part of the dramatist would have been noted and resented by his audience, for in the presentation of historical matter not novelty but verisimilitude was their demand.

The close following of his sources necessarily affected Heywood's dramatic technique. His historical and mythological plays we have already remarked show a reversion to the early chronicle history form. "Edward IV" and "If You Know Not Me, You Know No Bodie" are marked by a lack of dramatic unity. They are episodic and disjointed, and have none of the rise and fall of dramatic action that characterize the great history plays of Shakespeare. There is no climax in the action and no catastrophe; the plays are simply a chronologically arranged sequence of incidents, set on the stage much as they appear in their chronicle sources. The same charge can be made against "The Rape of Lucrece" and, to a lesser degree, against "The Late Lancashire Witches," while the kaleidoscopic changes in scene and character of the four "Ages" and "The Four Prentises of London" bespeak in even more startling fashion the dramatist's adoption in his early work of a slap-dash method of play construction.

To a courtly Elizabethan audience a dramatic technique such as this could not be acceptable. The aristocracy had been

educated up to a more skilled technique. They knew of the classical unities, and, though they did not demand absolute adherence to them, did expect a certain unity of action. But technique such as Heywood's, in the dramas cited, goes back to the early pageant method of the mystery and morality plays or of the earliest chronicle history plays. It contains plenty of spectacular material but it lacks unity of action. It is discursive and so far as plot construction is concerned unskilled—a relic of native English drama. As such it made its appeal primarily to the less highly cultured; to those whose conception of an historical play was that it should be a more or less panoramic presentation of historical events, rather than the closely-knit narrative of the rise or fall of one outstanding historical character.

Poor plot construction of a somewhat different nature is to be found in Heywood's later plays—his romantic comedies and his domestic tragedies. In these he makes use in most instances of two or more stories, that is of a main plot and one or more sub-plots. In a skilfully contrived drama this can be done very successfully by making the sub-plot dependent upon and very closely connected with the main plot, but in Heywood's plays such is not the case. They are very loosely constructed, and in the majority of instances the ties between the various plots introduced are so slim as to be nominal. This again is evidence of a crudeness of workmanship, partly due to the rapidity of the dramatist's composition, partly to the fact that he had an uncritical audience, who came to be amused rather than to see an artistic production, partly to his own limitations as a dramatist.

The sub-plot, it is to be noted, is thrown in most generally to provide comic relief from the more serious plot of the play. This is true especially of the domestic tragedies, in which the most pathetic and moving scenes are flanked by scenes calculated to produce merriment. Apparently the bourgeois spectator preferred to take his tragedy adulterated. He did not come to the theatre merely to be moved to tears but desiring also to be provoked to mirth; and, therefore, a blending of the two was most to his mind. A flagrant instance of this is to be found in that queer conglomerate, "The Rape of Lucrece." In it the rape itself is followed immediately by

a scene in which the gay Valerius sings his songs, the scene finally concluding with the coarsest of coarse catches, "Did he take faire Lucrece by the toe, man?" sung lustily by Horatius, Valerius and the clown in unison. The whole effect of the moving scene that has preceded is thus destroyed, but the rougher element in the audience has been delighted. Here is a song to its mind, the sort of clowning that it could appreciate. Nothing like this could ever have appeared in the dramatic work of a writer for courtly Elizabethan society. It could enjoy a vulgar joke, it is true, but vulgarity of this type is distinctly bourgeois. And it is the sort of vulgarity of which Heywood, the writer for the bourgeoisie, is often guilty. He must have seen the inappropriateness of the scene in question—for Heywood was a Cambridge man and must have read his Aristotle—but knowing the tastes of his crowd, he knew that they would applaud it and, with his characteristic desire to please, he deliberately inserted it.

The manner of Heywood's use throughout all his plays of the clown of native English drama is another instance of this. Eckhardt in his treatise on "Die lustige person im älteren Englischen Drama,"¹ has dealt very thoroughly with Heywood's use of this figure, and throws much light on his ancestry and prescribed functions. In Heywood his duties are in the main to provide comic relief, and he appears with his time-worn and often smutty jests at the most inappropriate times and in the most inappropriate surroundings. We find him as Pompey in the Rome of the Tarquins, for Pompey in spirit is no Roman but pure English. We find him in part in Valerius, for Valerius' songs are lusty English songs. We find him in the "Ages," and in all the romantic dramas without any exception. In "The Foure Prentises of London" we get a glimpse of him as the unpleasant clown, who attacks the old Earl of Bulloigne. No matter where the scene be laid, the stock clown always appears, but seldom has he any great part to play in the action proper. In "Edward IV" we have Hobs, and also Jane Shore's servant Dickie; in "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie" the clown character is not missing. In "The Faire Maid of the West" he reaches his

¹ Edward Eckhardt, "Die lustige person im älteren Englischen Drama (bis 1642)," Berlin, 1902.

zenith in the person of Clem. Clem is a genuinely funny clown. He is English through and through, and it is his English cocksureness that makes him such a gloriously incongruous figure at the court of Mullisheg. There is no question as to the ancestry of Clem and his fellow-clowns of Heywood's plays. They are descended in the first place from the devil and the Vice of the moralities or from figures such as the comic Noah and his wife. But it must be noted at the same time that Heywood's clowns differ very radically from these, their dramatic ancestors. Unlike Shakespeare's clowns, Feste and Touchstone, for example, they retain little or nothing of the mischievous qualities of the Vice. They do not play pranks on those around them, and laugh at the outcome of their own cleverness. For Heywood's clowns seem to have been born without malice. They take no delight in tormenting others, and have no particular butts for their jests, probably because they themselves have not the wit to do so effectively. They are all cast, it may be noted, in one mould. For almost every one is an honest and faithful servant, following his master or mistress throughout all adversities, and cheerfully enduring all vicissitudes of fortune. His comedy is not of a very high order. Often it is nothing but crude horseplay, the sort of thing one would expect of a mere country yokel or of a man of very meagre education. But he is always a truly human figure, although of a stereotyped nature, and his antics and jokes, clumsy though they are, must have been vastly pleasing to a rough audience with a delight in the broadest of broad humour.

The language of the clowns has a very bourgeois flavour. A passage from "*Love's Maistresse*" will illustrate the type of insipid wit in which they revelled:

"Come to mee but one houre in a morning, and Ile read deeper philosophie to you; good-morrow Neighbours; Poets, quoth a; What's titule tu patule but Titles and Pages; What's Propria que maribus but a proper man loves Mary-bons, or Foeminno generi tribunter, but the feminine gender is troublesome; What's Ovid, but quasi avoide; now should I be in love, with whom? with Doll, what's that but dole and lamentation, with Jugg, what's she but sister to a black-pot, or what's Pegg, good for nothing but to drive into a poste; no Cupid, I defie thee and all thy geneologie."¹

¹ "*Love's Maistresse*" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 114).

The jests are vapid and crude, as are most of the jests of Heywood's clowns, but still they must have satisfied his house. The very coarseness of the language of some of the comic passages testifies to the presence of a coarse-minded crowd. Take the vulgarity of a song like this :

" What say you to bonny Betty,
Ha you seene a lasse so pretty ?
But her body is so sweatty ;
Therefore Ile ha none of Betty,
No, no, no, no, no."¹

And yet this song is by no means the most unclean in the play. Heywood's comedy is for strong stomachs. He does not pick and choose his words, but writes with a frankness that after all has nothing prurient about it.

In his more serious work his language is simple, direct and telling. There is no bombast, except in the extremely early plays, and scarcely any rhetoric. Heywood uses the language of the citizens, and often by its very freedom from adornment achieves results which he would not otherwise achieve. This is especially patent in the most important scenes in "*A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*," and "*The English Traveller*." The dialogue in the following scene, which it is worth while quoting in full, shows Heywood at his best. It is clear, vivid, to the point, and stripped of all that is unnecessary. Frankford has just obtained clear proof of his wife's guilt.

Anne: O by what word ? what title ? or what name shall
I entreate your pardon ? Pardon : Oh
I am as farre from hoping such sweete grace
As Lucifer from heaven. To call you Husband ;
(O me most wretched) I have lost that name
I am no more your wife.

Nick.: Sblood sir she sounds.

Fran.: Spare thou thy teares, for I will weepe for thee ;
And keepe thy count'nance for I'le blush for thee ;
Now I protest I thinke 'tis I am tainted,
For I am most asham'd ; and 'tis more hard
For me to looke upon thy guilty face,
Than on the sun's cleere brow : What wouldst thou
speake ?

Anne: I would I had no tongue, no eares, no eyes
No apprehension, no capacity.

¹ "*Rape of Lucrece*" (Pearson Ed., Vol. V, p. 195).

When do you spurne me like a dog? When tread me
Under your feete? When drag me by the haire?
Though I deserve a thousand thousand folde
More than you can inflict: yet once my husband,
For womanhood to which I am a shame,
Though once an ornament: Even for his sake
That hath redeem'd our soules, marke not my face,
Nor hacke me with your sword: but let me go
Perfect and undeformed to my Tombe.
I am not worthy that I should prevaile
In the least suite; no, not to speake to you,
Nor looke on you; nor to be in your presence.
Yet as an object this one sute I crave
This granted I am ready for my grave.

Fran.: My God with patience arme me: rise, nay rise
And I'll debate with thee: Was it for want
Thou plaidst the strumpet? Was thou not supplied
With every pleasure, fashion and new toy;
Nay even beyond my calling?

Anne: I was.

Fran.: Was it then disability in me?
Or in thine eye seem'd he a proper man?

Anne: O no.

Fran.: Did I not lodge thee in my bosome? Weare thee
Here in my heart?

Anne: You did.

Fran.: I did indeed;
Witnesse my teares I did.
Go bring my infants hither. O Nan, O Nan,
If neither feare of shame, regard of honour,
The blemish of my house, nor my deere love
Could have withheld thee from as lewd a fact;
Yet for these infants, these young harmlesse soules,
On whose white browes thy shame is character'd,
And growes in greatnesse as they wax in yeares;
Looke but on them and melt away in teares.
Away with them; lest as her spotted body
Hath stain'd their names with stripes of bastardy,
So her adulterous breath may blast their spirits
With her infectious thoughts. Away with them.

Anne: In this one life I dyd ten thousand deaths.

Fran.: Stand up, Stand up, I will do nothing rashly
I will retire awhile into my study,
And thou shalt heare thy sentence presently."¹

¹ "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" (Pearson Ed., Vol. III, pp. 139-40).

The effectiveness of dialogue such as this is obvious. By a series of direct stern questions Frankford convicts his wife of her sin. Then he orders their children to be brought into their presence, and for a moment breaks down completely, as his simple words of bitterest reproach, "O Nan, O Nan," show. The scene is full of the deepest emotion, yet without mawkishness or straining for effect. The diction is that of everyday middle-class people, not that of the mouthing player.

Heywood on occasions, as in "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon," attacks pretentious pedantry. The latinity of Sir Boniface almost as much as the ignorance of Sir Harry are held up to ridicule. There is surely laughter at a certain type of learning in certain speeches assigned to the worthy tutor. "Sit faustum tibi omen. I'll tell you my nomen,"¹ he declares on being asked his name. His "quomodo vales," Taber takes to mean "go with me to the ale-house," and makes his plans accordingly, later giving the Knight the somewhat unsavoury name, Sir Bawdyface, a poor pun worthy of any of Heywood's clowns. The famous scene, wherein Sencer as Sir Timothy presents himself to Sir Harry as Sir Boniface's rival, contains even more striking slaps at the latter's learning. One of Sir Boniface's chief characteristics in speech is the way he weaves Latin and English together in his sentences. This Sencer takes off to perfection amidst roars of laughter from an appreciative audience. With all his own knowledge of the classics, Heywood is seldom, if ever, the pedant, and to him as to the bourgeois constituency of his theatre, pedantry is most ludicrous and most distasteful.

So much then for the more technical side of his dramatic work. To turn now to the subject-matter of his plays. In the first place his versatility is in its way evidence of his desire to please a large and varied public. He writes plays to suit the changing tastes of his crowd, and fills them full of diverse matter, so that all may be satisfied. He tries his hand at history plays, at the popular presentation of mythology, at classic comedy, at romance, at domestic drama, at satire, and at stage journalism. This in itself reveals the professional playwright, but a study of the individual classes of plays is even more illuminating.

¹ "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon," Act II, Scene ii.

Heywood himself explains, in his "Apology for Actors," what he believes to be the true function of English history plays:

"To turne to our domesticke hystories: what English blood, seeing the person of any bold Englishman presented, and doth not hugge his fame, and hunnye at his valor, pursuing him in his enterprise with his best wishes, and as being wrapt in contemplation, offers to him in his hart all prosperous performance, as if the personator were the man personated? so bewitching a thing is lively and well-spirited action, that it hath power to new-mold the harts of the spectators, and fashion them to the shape of any noble and notable attempt. What coward to see his countrymen valiant, would not bee ashamed of his own cowardise? What English prince, should hee behold the true portrature of that famous King Edward the Third, foraging France, taking so great a King captive in his owne country, quartering the English lyons with the French flower-delyce, and would not bee suddenly inflam'd with so royale a spectacle, being made apt and fit for the like achievement."¹

History plays, it has already been remarked, for very obvious reasons appealed to an Elizabethan theatre-going crowd. Their spectacular possibilities were enormous. Kings and queens and nobles could throng the stage in gorgeous raiment, battles could be fought before the eyes of the populace, and great historical scenes could be enacted with fitting splendour. Besides, were English history the theme, as Heywood suggests, the patriotism of the audience could be aroused. They could see their own country in the making, and realize her place in the history of the ages. And, finally, a history play might be made the fit vehicle for propaganda, anti-catholic propaganda, as for example in Bale's "King John" or the first part of Heywood's "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie." Heywood's "Edward IV" gratifies all these interests. It satisfies the love of battles and stirring scenes; it presents historical scenes and historical characters; it is patriotic, as are both parts of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie." But Heywood does not stop with this. After all, these elements are old elements, and he sees an opportunity to make a new bid for the favour of the bourgeoisie. And so he gives to the common citizen, to the merchant and the

¹ "Apology for Actors" (Ed. Shakespeare Soc., 1841, p. 21).

prentice alike, a new position in historical dramas. To the writers of history plays who had preceded him the plain citizen was of little importance. It was with kings and queens and gentles of high degree that they dealt; of the common man they had little to say, and only mentioned him with dignified tolerance, if not with scorn. But Heywood represents the middle and lower classes as taking their place in national life. Not merely that, but he makes of them almost heroic figures. Thus we have Matthew Shore and Mayor Crosbie in "Edward IV," and Gresham and good old Hobson in "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie." Shore is the real hero of the two parts of "Edward IV." True the king himself was a popular figure, the idol in his day of middle-class and artisan London, but, man for man, Shore is by far the nobler character. The picture of Gresham in Part II of the plays about Elizabeth's reign has already been discussed fully, and needs no further comment. He, too, is a true bourgeois hero. Even the prentices of London come in for their due meed of praise. It is their valour under the leadership of the courageous Crosbie that saves their loved city from Falconbridge and his troops.

In addition a new biographical element can be seen in the two parts of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie." Part I is almost a journalistic account of the trials of Princess Elizabeth, while Part II in like wise tells us the story of Sir Thomas Gresham and the founding of the Royal Exchange. The change of emphasis from the purely historical to the more domestic is brought out, too, by the pictures of contemporary life that give colour to the play. The story of Hobs, the tanner, with its country scenes, and the city scenes in the stories of the Shores and of Gresham, constitute the real charm of the play, for they give us vivid glimpses of Elizabethan peasant and middle-class life. And their very presence in history dramas reveals Heywood's interest in and desire to please those classes.

Finally, the domestic tragedy elements in the sufferings of the Shores strike a new note of sentiment. Here is the story of the forgiving husband and the erring wife that Heywood was eventually to develop to such dramatic perfection. It is the beginning of that bourgeois tragedy, which since Heywood's

day has steadily increased in importance as a distinct branch of our drama.

"Is thy minde noble, and wouldst thou be further stir'd up to magnanimity? Behold upon the stage thou maist see Hercules, Achilles, Alexander, Cæsar, Alcibiades, Lysander, Sertorius, Hannibal, Antigonus, Philip of Macedon, Mithridates of Pontus, Pyrrhus of Epirus; Agesilaus among the Lacedamonians; Epaminondas amongst the Thebans; Scaevola alone entering the armed tents of Porsenna: Horatius Cocles alone withstanding the whole army of the Heturians; Leonidas of Sparta choosing a lyon to leade a band of deere, rather than one deere to conduct an army of lyons, with infinite others, in their own persones, qualities, and shapes, animating thee with courage, deterring thee from cowardice. . . ."¹

"To see as I have seene, Hercules, in his owne shape, hunting the boare, knocking down the bull, taming the hart, fighting with Hydra, murdering Geryon, slaughtering Diomed, wounding the Stymphalides, killing the Centaurs, pashing the lyon, squeezing the dragon, dragging Cerberus in chaynes, and lastly, on his high pyramides writing Nil ultra, Oh, these were sights to make an Alexander!"²

It can easily be seen from these quotations from "The Apology for Actors"—quotations which sound like an actual apology for much of his own work—what were Heywood's objects in writing his classical dramas. There is the same purpose that we have already noted in the English history plays, to provide spectacular and exciting elements for a crowd that delighted in spectacles and excitement. And in these plays the spectacles are presented on an extremely grand scale. Gods and goddesses and heroes adorn the stage, monsters appear, and amidst bursting fireworks we are given a glimpse of hell itself. Great battles are fought around the walls of Troy, or in "The Rape of Lucrece" on the plains of Latium. Oracles are consulted, and give their enigmatic answers. It is a splendid world of marvels to which the ravished prentice is transported.

But the dramatist does not merely have a spectacle in view. He desires at the same time to inspire to noble deeds through the presentation of noble deeds, and he wishes to educate in the classic lore, that is so dear to him, an audience which has not his education. His method is, however, unique.

¹ "Apology for Actors" (Shakespeare Soc. Ed., pp. 55-56). ² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

For the scenes in his "Ages," following each other as they do with cinematographic rapidity, represent incidents from classical myth in a distinctly vulgarized form. Instead of graceful allegory we have coarse plebeian comedy in the scenes between Jupiter and Callisto or Alcmena or Danae. Jupiter has cast aside all his divinity and appears before us in buckram, a rakish young man of the day with this advantage that his position gives him far greater opportunities to pursue his amours with success. Juno, a somewhat shrewish wife, does not approve of his escapades, and so his main object is to avoid her ever-watchful eye. Her jealousy is matched only by his cunning. Whereas the Jupiter of classic myth visits Danae in a bright cloud of gold, Heywood's Jupiter, in the tattered garments of a peddler, buys his way into the lady's tower. Mars, a lusty young fellow, is represented as caught in an embarrassing situation by the wily Vulcan, and all the details of the affair are shown on the stage without any compunction. The whole might be a congeries of pot-house tales rather than a dramatization of the classics. Written even at its worst in the spirit of fun, it is vulgar in the extreme—gross comedy that must have been attended by uproarious laughter. It is, besides, intensely realistic. The gods are not on Olympus but in Cheapside; their language, their attitude towards life, the setting in which they appear, are all contemporary. In this they are not unlike the fleshly deities in the art of the fundamentally bourgeois Rubens. It is a delightful instance of the same broad native humour that enlivened the old mystery plays, and made Noah's wife a shrew and Herod a ranter, now applied, however, to classical legend. Incongruous and coarse though it is, there is a freshness and vigour about it that makes it most enjoyable. Bourgeois taste is responsible. Lyly's plays written for court performance retain something of the loveliness and fanciful qualities of their classical sources, but here the abstract and fanciful has become material and familiar.

There is the same vulgarization even in the telling of the Lucrece story, an admixture of pathos and the crudest of crude comedy. Into tragedy have crept in this case the antic humours of the native English clown and the scurvy London songs of Valerius. In "The Iron Age," finally, we have

revenge play elements that have their origin in the immense popularity of "The Spanish Tragedy" and similar dramas of the Senecan school. A great diversity of ingredients, then, have been poured into the classical plays to make them popular with the bourgeoisie, and their success, we know, was signal.

The hold that mediæval romances had come to have upon the Elizabethan middle-classes adequately explains the joy of Heywood's audience in the fantastic and unreal "Foure Prentises of London." The presence in this play of prentices as knights errant gives it an added attraction, and shows how the dramatist was bidding for applause. Akin to these citizen heroes are Bess Bridges in "The Faire Maid of the West," and Dick Bowyer and Dick Pike in the doubtfully-ascribed "Tryall of Chevalry" and "Dicke of Devonshire." All of these plays strike the note of nationalism, a note even more present in "A Challenge for Beautie." There is realism, however, in "The Faire Maid of the West" that is missing in "The Foure Prentises of London," for the play is one of sea-adventure such as was recorded of the great Elizabethan seamen. The inevitable association of the brave deeds of Bess and of Spencer with those of the gallant sea-heroes of England would thrill the hearts of the Londoners who still bore in mind the glorious days of the Armada, and of Raleigh, Frobisher, and Drake. No play so well reflects the adventurous spirit of Englishmen of the day, and it is indeed noteworthy that Heywood should have been the writer.

The romances based on Italian sources are the least bourgeois of all Heywood's plays. They are conventional, and not in his most characteristic manner. But even in them, it has been noted, there are native elements in the clowns that are present in them all, and in the extremely realistic portrayal of London life, that gives vivacity to their comic sub-plots.

The domestic tragedies are essentially of and for the citizens. A foretaste of them is to be found in the Jane Shore story in "Edward IV" and in the story of Lucrece, but their real foundations are to be discovered in the long line of murder plays that have their best example in "Arden of Feversham." They make no pretensions to being anything but simple bourgeois drama. "Our muse is bent," says the prologue to "A Woman Kilde with Kindness," "upon a barraine subject ;

a bare sceane."¹ The prologue to "The English Traveller" is very similar :

"A strange play you are like to have, for knowe
We use no drum, nor trumpet, nor dumbe show ;
No combats, marriage, not so much to-day
As song, dance, masque to bombaste out a play ;
Yet these all good and still in frequent use
With our best poets ; nor is this excuse
Made by our author, as if want of skill
Caus'd this defect ; it's rather his selfe will :
Will you the reason know ? There have so many
Beene in that kind, that hee desires not any
At this time in his sceane, no helpe, no straine,
Or flash that's borrowed from another's braine ;
Nor speakes hee this that hee would have you feare it
He onely tries if once bare lines will beare it ;
Yet may't afford, so please you silent sit
Some mirth, some matter and perhaps some wit."²

They are to be straightforward unadorned dramas dealing with ordinary life, the sort of life the middle-class citizen could best understand, since it was his own home that was being portrayed. Simplicity, vigour, emotion with restraint that kept it from mawkishness, sympathetic humanity, and vivid realism, these are the qualities that stand out in Heywood's plays of domestic life, and make them surpass all previous dramatic work along similar lines. He has a real understanding of bourgeois character and reveals it with an appreciative and kindly bent. The principal characters in the plays are all of the middle-classes. No kings or queens or fine gentlemen of the court appear at all to dazzle the audience, but they see before them distinctly London figures—young men about town, the sons of rich merchants, some like young Geraldine travelled and cultured ; old and respected heads of commercial houses, like Wincott ; landed gentry like Frankford and Acton and Wendoll ; country servants and city servants ; inn-keepers and hostlers and potboys ; artisans and prentices ; the doubles on the stage of all the varied types that formed the jostling crowd that thronged the theatre.

And the action of the plays is distinctly to their taste. There are two plots, one more serious, one more comic. The

¹ "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse," Prologue (Pearson Ed., Vol. II, p. 81).

² "The English Traveller," Prologue (Pearson Ed., Vol. IV, p. 6).

latter provides the necessary comic relief. The former, closely bordering on the sentimental, shows the soul of an every-day hero under stress. It is a moral tale, for though it preaches that sin has its inevitable punishment it insists that vengeance is not for man but for God. Man must learn to forgive, and to endure with patience. Frankford thanks God that he did not kill Wendoll; young Geraldine that he was saved from bloodshed. The piety and genuine virtues of these heroes are extolled and held up for admiration. Small wonder then that the plays were acted over and over again before approving houses. No other playwright had ever endowed citizen character with such conspicuous morality. And the best of it is that Heywood is perfectly sincere. He does not write with the desire to flatter, but he really appreciates the good and worthy in the sober, industrious, and good-hearted middle-class. For, after all, is he not of that class himself and proud to be considered as such?

Heywood was, above all else, a citizen of London, "the famous and faire renowned city," as he styles it on the title-page of all his Lord Mayor's pageants. That he knew London well is undoubted. He can mention in chronological order her mayors, and tell what each of them accomplished for the glory of the city, and this as early in his career as 1596, when he wrote the two parts of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie."¹ He is informed on all manner of civic history, and is genuinely proud of the solid qualities, which had given London merchants their pre-eminence in the commercial world. He praises the guilds, and—though here he was to a large degree pot-boiling—writes pageants for them in which their important functions in the life of the city and of the nation are recorded. One cannot help thinking of the pageants that they are very like the "Doelen" pictures of Rembrandt or of Hals; certainly the motives that gave them birth were the same. Heywood was not alone in writing such pageants, but still the fact that he did write them shows what community he was at all times anxious to serve. His attitude toward the merchant or the labourer, it is to be noted, is one of equality rather than of superiority. He never looks down upon a man because he

¹ "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie" Part II (Pearson Ed., Vol. I, pp. 276-79.)

works with his hands, or because his business is to buy and sell merchandise. In fact, in characters like old Hobson¹ he has endeavoured to show us how estimable a plain tradesman can be; in "The Foure Prentises of London" his heroes all unite in telling us how profitable and praiseworthy it is for a man to be able by some craft to support himself. All this is distinctly popular stuff, as popular to-day as it was in Heywood's own time.

The note of sentiment that runs through Heywood's bourgeois morality should have a large place in any estimate of his work such as this aspires to be. What applause must have greeted the figure of the gallant Spencer, who, to keep a promise to an honourable foe, abandoned his sweetheart and all chance of escape to go back to almost certain death at the court of Morocco! How that perfect English gentleman, Mont Ferrers, who, in order to repay the kindness of Valladaura, underwent the very severest tests of friendship, must have appealed to the national spirit of the mob! The forgiveness of Frankford and of Generous must have been equally effective. The pathos of the great scene already quoted, wherein Frankford discovers his wife's infidelity and reproaches her, or of the scene wherein he removes all that may remind him of her from his house, cannot have failed to move an unspoiled audience easily moved to pity. To me there is little mawkishness in Heywood's sentiment. The sophisticated may sneer at it, and call it sentimentality, but though it may verge on that it seldom if ever crosses the border-line that separates sentimentality from true feeling. Heywood was too simple-hearted himself ever to be sentimental in the worst sense of the word, and it is only a cynic that dare call him so.

When he becomes satirical, as he does in "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon," despite his frank and severe censure, he is on the whole genial. Like most honest men, he hates frauds, and does not flinch from exposing them. However, he is never bitter or petty. We see the charlatanism and the immorality of the Wise Woman, but there is little malice in the satire. She even plays her part in bringing about the final happy ending of the play, and is not pictured as entirely bad. Heywood's satire on the pedant is even less bitter. He

¹ "If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie."

laughs, as has already been pointed out, at his latinisms, but shows us also Sir Boniface's more human side. True, Sir Boniface is allied to the Wise Woman, and a partner in her nasty business, but this relationship is not emphasized as it would be were some less kindly dramatist, like Jonson, writing the drama. In fact, his satire is realistic rather than satiric. He simply gives us pictures from the life he knew, and if, as in the case of the bawds in "The Royall King and Loyall Subject," the characters happen to be vicious he comes out flat-footed in his condemnation of them and their kind. This, in part, is simply another expression of that bourgeois morality we have seen glorifying Frankford and young Geraldine and the other heroes of his domestic drama. His satire, then, is, like his sentiment, of the bourgeoisie; its main object is to expose evil realistically and at the same time to amuse, for both the Wise Woman and Sir Boniface are obviously comic figures.

A final trait in Heywood is the journalistic trend of much of his work. This has already been noted in the two parts of "If You Knowe Not Me, You Know No Bodie," and is apparent in the setting of "The Faire Maid of the West" and in the relation of the story of Dick Pike. It is in part propaganda—anti-catholic in the Elizabeth play and national in "The Faire Maid of the West." The best instance of this, however, is to be seen in "The Late Lancashire Witches," where we have on the stage a narrative of events of contemporary interest. In the absence of newspapers the stage was the natural place for such matter. True, there were popular tracts telling the story of famous murders, adventures, etc., tracts which were hawked in the streets and widely read. But Heywood was quick to realize the possibilities of staging such matter of popular interest. A play is far more vivid than any tract, however sensational it may be, just as world events as shown on the moving picture screen probably give more people correct information on current history than any number of paragraphs in the daily papers. A number of witches had been tried and found guilty in Lancashire; they were now in London awaiting a new and final judgment; all London was agog with excitement. People wanted to know all about the case. Heywood saw his chance, and billed a performance at which

the whole story was to be told. He played up to popular prejudices, because he himself believed the defendants guilty. Not content with the dramatic possibilities of the trial he added a new element of sentiment, though preserving in the main the outlines of the legal proceedings. No wonder his theatre was crowded with interested spectators and his comedy was "well received."

In subject-matter, then, as in technique, Thomas Heywood was a writer for the bourgeoisie. But at the end of his dramatic career he seems to have suffered a change of heart. For "Love's Maistresse," a play performed both publicly and at the court, though possibly written primarily for the latter, contains an apparent recantation on the part of the dramatist. In it he satirizes popular taste, and, while introducing comic elements in the dances and shows of Midas, takes pains to emphasize the superiority of the more serious and more cultured side of his drama, the story of Cupid and Psyche. Midas, who does not appreciate the allegorical story of which Apuleius is presenter, represents the prosperous and commonsense burgher, who takes no stock in abstract court productions. He wants clowns and songs and dances and rough jokes to liven things up. So all the beauty and meaning of Apuleius' play is lost on him. It is not the songs of Apollo, but the songs of Pan that delight him. Heywood points out his folly in maintaining this attitude, but after all Heywood is not the man to do so, for in all his other plays he has done his best to gratify the vulgar tastes which he is now condemning. However, his motive, I believe, was honest. He actually felt at this period in his life that he had been on the wrong tack in his earlier work, and is perfectly sincere in his desire to make amends.

For Heywood, however great his willingness to grasp every available opportunity of pleasing his public—and in this he showed, as we have seen, surprising ability—is essentially a man of worthy character, honest, earnest, and sincere. As a playwright he feels he has a very high trust to fulfil. "First, playing is an ornament to the citty, which strangers of all nations repairing hither report of in their own countries, beholding them here with some admiration; for what variety of entertainment can there be in any citty of christendome more than in London."¹ Secondly, the drama is helping to establish a

¹ "Apology for Actors" (Shakespeare Soc. Ed., p. 52).

standard and universal English. "Secondly our English tongue, which hath been the most harsh, uneven, and broken language of the world, part Dutch, part Irish, Saxon, Scotch, Welsh, and indeed a gallemaffry of many, but perfect in none, is now by the secondary meanes of playing continually refined, every writer striving in himselfe to adde a new florish unto it." "Thirdly, playes have made the ignorant more apprehensive, taught the unlearned the knowledge of many famous histories, instructed such as cannot reade in the discovery of all our English chronicles; and what men have you now of that weake capacity that cannot discourse of any notable thing recorded even from William the Conqueror, nay, from the landing of the Brute, until this day?"¹ Finally, plays have served to stimulate men to greater morality since in tragedies they can see the results of vice, in comedies the effects of folly.

We can see throughout his work how Heywood tries to live up to his trust. His plays are designed to please first of all, since by pleasing they can attract the attention of those who are to constitute his audience. They are varied in their themes, and contain historical and legendary matter that he deems will make "the ignorant more apprehensive" and teach the unlearned: they are to the honour of the city; and they have a moral application. Heywood was a reliable, pious, hard-working man and despite the coarseness of much of his comedy, fundamentally clean-minded. He was making a living out of the stage, and in doing so had to study the likes and dislikes of his crowd. Loyal to his company, he wrote his plays exclusively for his theatre with no desire to be "voluminously read." It was only when copies of his dramas, vilely edited, were sold without his consent that he himself began to put his plays into print in self-defence. He composed not for the future but for the present, and this gave his plays a distinctly contemporaneous flavour. But there were times when he was so deeply interested in his subject that for a time he ceased to be a mere playwright and became a dramatist of the very highest order. Plays such as "A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse" and "The Faire Maid of the West," each in their own way, have a perennial charm. Thus, with all his limitations, Heywood has a permanent place in the affections of students of the Elizabethan

¹ "Apology for Actors" (Shakespeare Soc. Ed., pp. 52-53).

drama. His freshness, his animal spirits, his good nature, his humanity, the strain of real feeling that gives charm to his simple unassuming work make him one of the most worthy of all the dramatists of his day. Of his plays, I think we may say that they are worthy of their author's motto, "*Aut Prodesse Solent, aut Delectare.*" That they were so bourgeois in spirit gives them a colour and interest that is by no means the least of their charm to students of his age.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I

Texts of Heywood's Works Used in this Study

DRAMAS

"The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood," Ed. by John Pearson, 1874.

Contents: Vol. I, A Memoir of Thomas Heywood—The First and Second Parts of "Edward IV"—"If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie," Parts 1 and 2. Vol. II, "The Fayre Mayde of the Exchange"—"A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse"—"The Foure Prentises of London"—"The Faire Maid of the West." Vol. III, "The Golden Age"—"The Silver Age"—"The Brazen Age"—"The Iron Age," Parts 1 and 2. Vol. IV, "The English Traveller"—"A Maydenhead well Lost"—"The Late Lancashire Witches"—"London's Jus Honorarium"—"London's Sinus Salutis"—"Londini Speculum." Vol. V, "A Challenge for Beautie"—"Love's Maistresse"—"The Rape of Lucrece"—"Londini Porta Pietatis"—"The Wise Woman of Hogsdon"—"Londini Status Pacatus." Vol. VI, "The Royall King and the Loyall Subject"—"Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's"—"Fortune by Land and Sea." Notes and illustrations are appended to each volume.

"Thomas Heywood," Ed. A Wilson Verity, with an introduction by J. Addington Symonds (Mermaid Series), London, 1888.

Contents: Introduction by Symonds—"A Woman Killed With Kindness"—"The Fair Maid of the West"—"The Wise Woman of Hogsdon"—"The Rape of Lucrece."

"The Captives or the Lost Recovered." Licensed by Sir H. Herbert in 1624, and now first printed from the Egerton MS. 1,994." In A.H. Bullen "A Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. IV, London, 1882-85, with an introduction by the editor.

"Captives, The, or the Lost Recovered," Ed. by A. C. Judson, 1921, with a very useful introduction giving the history and sources of the play.

"Challenge, A, for Beautie, a tragi-comedy." In Dilke, "Old English Plays," Vol. VI, pp. 323-425, 1815.

- "Dicke of Devonshire." In A. H. Bullen, "A Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. II, London, 1882-85.
- "Edward IV, The First and Second Parts of," Ed. by B. Field, Shakespeare Soc. Pub., Vol. 13, London, 1842.
- "Faire Maide of the Exchange, The," Ed. by B. Field, Shakespeare Soc. Pub., Vol. 30, London, 1845.
- "Fair Maid of the West, The," Ed. by Katharine Lee Bates, Belles-Letters Series, 1917. Bound with an edition by Miss Bates of "A Woman Killed with Kindness," this volume contains an excellent biography and a very full Heywood bibliography.
- "Fair Maid of the West, The," Ed. by J. P. Collier, Shakespeare Soc. Pub., Vol. 42, London, 1850.
- "Fortune by Land and Sea," Ed. by B. Field, Shake. Soc. Pub., Vol. 30, London, 1845.
- "Foure Prentises of London, The." In R. Dodsley "A Select Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. VI, pp. 395-487, Collier's 3rd Ed., 1825.
- "Golden and Silver Ages, The," Ed. with an introduction by J. P. Collier, Shake. Soc. Pub., Vol. 46, London, 1851.
- "Good Wife from a Bad, How a Man May Choose a," Ed. by A. E. H. Swaen, "Materialien zur Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas," XXV. Swaen claims Heywood authorship.
- "King in the Country, A," London, 1789. Contains Hobs sections of "Edward IV."
- "Love's Maistresse, or the Queen's Masque." In C. Baldwyn, "Old English Drama," London, 1824.
- "Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas," Ed. by W. Bang, "Materialien zur Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas," Vol. III, Louvain, 1903.
- "Rape of Lucrece, The." In C. Baldwyn, "Old English Drama," London, 1824.
- "Royall King and Loyall Subject, The." In Dilke, "Old English Plays," Vol. VI, 1815.
- "Royall King and Loyall Subject, The," Ed. by J. P. Collier, Shake. Soc. Pub., Vol. 44, London, 1850. Bound with "A Woman Killed with Kindness," also Ed. by Collier.
- "Royall King and Loyall Subject, The," reprinted from quarto of 1637, and edited with introduction and notes by Kate Watkins Tibbals, Pub. of Univ. of Penn., Series in Philology and Literature, Vol. XII, 1906. This contains a

careful analysis of the plot, comparing it with Fletcher's "Loyal Subject," and Chapman's "Admiral Chabot."

"Tryall of Chevalry, The." In A. H. Bullen, "A Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. III, London, 1882-85.

"Woman Killed with Kindness, A." In R. Dodsley, "A Select Collection of Old English Plays," Vol. VII, pp. 215-91, London, 1825.

"Woman Killed with Kindness, A," Ed. by Sir A. W. Ward (Temple Dramatists), 1897.

"Woman Killed with Kindness, A," Ed. F. J. Fox, 1907.

"Woman Killed with Kindness, A," Ed. Katherine Lee Bates, with "The Fair Maid of the West."

OTHER PLAYS ASCRIBED TO HEYWOOD

"Appius and Virginia." In John Webster, "Dramatic Works," Ed. by W. Hazlitt, Vol. III, London, 1857.

"Captain Thomas Stukeley, The Famous History of." In Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1909.

"Hoffman, the Tragedy of," in Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1913.

"Nobody and Somebody," in Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1909.

"Sir Thomas Wyatt, The Famous History of." In Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1914. Also in "The Dramatic Works of John Webster," Ed. by W. Hazlitt, Vol. I, London, 1857.

"Thracian Wonder, The." In John Webster, "Dramatic Works," Ed. by W. Hazlitt, Vol. IV, London, 1857.

"Warning for Faire Women, A," reprinted in "The School of Shakespeare," Ed. by R. Simpson, Vol. II, 1878.

NON-DRAMATIC WORKS

"Apology for Actors," Ed. by J. P. Collier, Shake. Soc. Pub., 1841. Bound with Gosson's "School of Abuse."

"England's Elizabeth," reprinted in "Harleian Miscellany," Vol. X, 1813.

"Gunaikeion, or History of Women," Ed. of 1624. Adam. Islip, London.

"Marriage Triumph on the Nuptials of the Prince Palatine and Princess Elizabeth," reprinted from Ed. of 1613, by Percy Soc., XII, London, 1842.

"Reader, here You'l Plainly See Judgement Perverted by these Three: a Priest, a Judge, a Patentee," reprinted from Ed. of 1641.

II

**Critical Works Consulted in the Compilation
of the Thesis**

(Articles appearing in periodical form are listed later.)

"Ages, The." Collateral reading for :

- i. Dramas: "The Birthe of Hercules," Ed. M. W. Wallace, 1903, Malone Society Reprint, 1911.
 "The History of Horestes," J. Pikerling, Tudor Fac. Texts.
 "Amphitruo," Plautus, T. M. (Tr. H. T. Riley, London, 1912).
- ii. Verse: "The Siege of Troy," Ed. by C. H. A. Wager, 1899, from Harleian MS. 525.
 Recuyell," R. Lefevre, Tr. and printed by Wm. Caxton about 1474, reproduced with introduction, index and glossary, London, 1894.
 "Troy Book," J. Lydgate, reproduced with introduction, index and glossary, London, 1894, Nos. 97, 103, 106.
 "Troia Britannica or Great Britain's Troy," T. Heywood, 1609. "The Life and Death of Hector," 1614.

Adams, J. Q., "Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert" (reference to the production of the "Captives" by Heywood).

Beaumont, F. and Fletcher, J., "The Knight of the Burning Pestle," Ed. Murch, 1908, with introduction, notes and glossary. The introduction deals with the popularity of romances and plays based on romance in Heywood's time, and contains much matter that is of value in a study particularly of "The Foure Prentises of London," of which Beaumont's play is a burlesque.

Brooke, Rupert, "John Webster and the Elizabethan Drama," 1916. An especially valuable appendix to this work claims Heywood authorship of "Appius and Virginia."

Cambridge History of English Literature, The, 1910, Vol. VI, Chapter on Heywood, by Sir A. W. Ward.

"Captives, The." Collateral reading for :

- i. Plautus, T. M., "Rudens," Tr. by H. T. Riley, London, 1912.
- ii. T. Heywood, "Gunaikeion," Bk. V, pp. 253-56, "The Faire Lady of Norwich," for sub-plot.

"Challenge for Beautie, A." Collateral reading for:

Drama: P. Massinger, "The Picture," Ed. Cunningham and Gifford.
 Shakespeare, "Cymbeline."

Novellae: William Painter, "Palace of Pleasure," II, Nov. 28, Lope de Rueda, "Eufemia," *vide* J. C. Klein, "Geschichte des Spanischen Drama's" Leipzig, 1872, Band II, pp. 144-56.

Ballads: Th. Evans, "Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative," 1810, Vol. I, pp. 77 ff. "The Two Faithful Friends."

Collier, J. P., "History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration," 1879. (Miscellaneous information.)

Creizenach, W. M. A., "The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare," 1916, a translation of Books I—VII of W. M. A. Creizenach, "Geschichte des Neueren Dramas," 1893, which should also be consulted.

"*Dicke of Devonshire.*" *Collateral reading for:*

E. Arber, "English Garner," 1877-83, I, 621-39. "Three in One" (the story of Dick Pike).

Dictionary of Natural Biography, 1885-1901, Article by Sir A. W. Ward, on Thomas Heywood, Vol. XXVI, 1891.

Eckhardt, E., "Die Lustige Person im Alteren Englischen Drama (bis 1642)," Berlin, 1902. A great deal of information on Heywood's clowns.

"*Edward IV.*" *Collateral reading for:*

i. Ballads: Percy, "Reliques of Ancient English Poetry," Series II, 15; "King Edward IV and the Tanner of Tamworth," Series II, 26, "Jane Shore."

Ritson, "Pieces of Ancient Popular Poetry from Authentic MSS. and Printed Copies" (1791), "The King and the Barker."

ii. Chronicles: Holinshed, Halle, and Sir Thomas More, "Richard III."

iii. Drama: Shakespeare, "Henry VI," "Richard III," Nicholas Rowe, "Jane Shore" (1714).

T. Legge, "Ricardus Tertius," reprinted in Hazlitt "Shakespeare's Library." "True Tragedie of Richard, Duke of York," "True Tragedie of Richard III," "The Siege of London," "Edward III," "Jack Strawe," "Sir Thomas Moore."

iv. Verse: Michael Drayton, "Heroical Epistles" (1597). Thomas Churchyard, "How Shore's Wife, King Edward the Fourth's Concubine, was by King Richard despoiled of her goods and forced to do open penance," "Mirour for Magistrates," Haslewood Ed., 1815, p. 461.

"*English Traveller, The.*" *Collateral reading for:*
Plautus, "*Mostellaria*," Tr. H. T. Riley, 1912.

"*Fair Maid of the West, The.*" *Collateral reading for:*
i. Percy, "*Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*," Series II, 19. "*Mary Ambree*."
ii. "*The Life of Long Megge of Westminster*," *Miscellanea Antiqua Anglicana*, 1816.

Fleay, F. G., "*A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559-1642*," 1800.
— "*A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*," 2 Vols., 1891.

"*Foure Prentises of London, The.*" *Collateral reading for:*
i. Beaumont and Fletcher, "*The Knight of the Burning Pestle*," Ed. Murch, 1908.
ii. Tasso, "*Godfrey of Bulloigne*," done into English by E. Fairfax, London, 1600.

Greg, W. W., "*A List of English Plays written before 1643 and printed before 1700*," London, 1900.
— "*A List of Masques, Pageants, etc., supplementary to a List of English Plays*," London, 1902.
— "*Henslowe's Diary*," Part I, Text, 1904. Part II, Commentary, 1904.
— "*Henslowe's Papers*," 1907.

Herford, C. H., "*Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*," Cambridge, 1886.

"*If You Knowe Not Me, You Knowe No Bodie.*" *Collateral reading for:*
i. Thomas Heywood, "*England's Elizabeth, her life and troubles during her minoritie from the cradle to the crown*," 1632, reprinted *Harleian Miscellany*, Vol. X, 1813.
ii. J. Rickets, "*Byrsa Basilica seu Regale Excambium*," 1570.

Kampfer, O., "*Das Verhaltnis von Heywood's 'Royal King' zu Painter's 'Palace of Pleasure'*," Halle, 1903.

Koepfel, E., "*Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's, John Marston's und Beaumont's und Fletcher's*," Leipzig, 1895. For the sources of "*The Royall King and Loyall Subject*" and "*A Challenge for Beautie*" (*Muenchener Beitrage* XI).

Lamb, Charles, "*Specimens of the English Dramatic Poets*," 1808.

- "Late Lancashire Witches, The."* Collateral reading for:
 i. T. Potts, "Discovery of Witches in Lancashire," Ed. James Crossley, Chetham Soc. Pub., Vol. IV.
- Lowell, James Russell*, "The Old English Dramatists," 1892.
- Murray, J. Tacker*, "English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642," 2 vols., Boston, 1910. Material concerning dates of plays and the history of the Companies to which Heywood belonged.
- Nason, A. H.*, "James Shirley, Dramatist," pp. 63-69 for discussion of "Dicke of Devonshire."
- "Rape of Lucrece, The."* Collateral reading for:
 i. Livy, "History of Rome."
- "Royall King and the Loyall Subject, The."* Collateral reading for:
 i. J. Fletcher, "The Loyal Subject" ("The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher," Alex. Dyce, Boston, 1854, Vol. I, p. 914-52).
 ii. Wm. Painter, "Palace of Pleasure," II, Nov. 4.
- Schelling, F. E.*, "The English Chronicle Play," N.Y., 1902.
 — "English Drama," London, 1914.
 — "Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1642," Boston, 1908, 2 vols.
- "Shakespeare's England,"* Oxford, 1917, 2 vols.
- Singer, H. W.*, "Das Burgerliche Trauerspiel in England (bis zum jahre 1800)," Leipzig, 1891. The best study of the origin and development of Elizabethan domestic tragedy.
- Swinburne, A. C.*, "The Age of Shakespeare," 1908. Contains an essay on Thomas Heywood.
- Symonds, J. A.*, "Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama," London, 1884.
- Tucker-Brooke, C. F.*, "The Tudor Drama," Boston, 1911.
- Ward, Sir A. W.*, "History of English Dramatic Literature," 1875, 2 vols. Revised and enlarged to 3 vols. in 1899.
- Warton, T.*, "History of English Poetry," Ed. W. C. Hazlitt, London, 1871.
- "Woman Killed with Kindness, A."* Collateral reading for:
 i. J. A. Symonds, "Renaissance in Italy," Vol. V, p. 99, for summary of novella by Bernardo Lapini, surnamed Illicini, on which sub-plot is based.
 ii. Wm. Painter, "Palace of Pleasure," I, Nov. 58, I, Nov. 43, main plot. II, Nov. 30, sub-plot.
 iii. Marguerite of Navarre, "Heptameron IV," No. 6.

III

Articles Relating to Heywood Appearing in Periodical Form

- Adams, Joseph Quincy, Jr., "Greene's 'Menaphon' and 'The Thracian Wonder'" ("Modern Philology," 1906, Vol. III, pp. 317-25). Discusses Fleay's attribution of the play to Heywood.
- "Thomas Heywood and 'How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad'" ("Englische Studien," 1912, Vol. XLV, pp. 30-44). Claims Heywood authorship.
 - "The Authorship of 'A Warning for Fair Women'" (Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub., 1913, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 594-620). Claims Heywood authorship.
 - "Captain Thomas Stukeley" ("Journal of English and Germanic Philology," 1916, Vol. XV, pp. 107-29). Claims Heywood authorship of the Stukeley scenes.
- Albert, F., "Über Thomas Heywood's 'The Life and Death of Hector' und Lydgate's 'Troy Book'" ("Muenchener Beitrage," 1909, bd. 42).
- Andrews, C. F., "The Authorship of the 'Late Lancashire Witches'" ("Mod. Lang. Notes," 1913, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 163-66).
- Aronstein, P., "Die Hexen im Englischen Renaissance Drama" ("Germanische Romanische Monatschrift," 1912, Vol. IV, pp. 536-49.)
- "Die Verfasserschaft des Dramas 'The Fair Maid of the Exchange'" ("Englische Studien," XLV-XLVI, pp. 45-60). Denies Heywood's authorship.
 - "Thomas Heywood" ("Anglia Zeitschrift," 1913, Vol. 37, pp. 163-268). The most complete study of Heywood's plays, with a life of the poet as introduction.
- Bang, Willy, and H. de Vocht, "Klassiken und Humanisten als quellen alterer Dramatiker" ("Englische Studien," 1906, Vol. 36, pp. 389-92).
- Bates, Katherine Lee, "A Conjecture as to Thomas Heywood's Family" ("Journal of English and Germanic Philology," 1913, Vol. 12).
- Brereton, J. Le Gay, "Notes on the Text of Thomas Heywood" ("Anglia Beiblatt," 1906, XVII, 108-23).
- Brooke, Rupert, "The Authorship of the late 'Appius and Virginia.'" ("Mod. Lang. Review," 1913, Vol. VIII, pp. 443-53). Brooke attributes the play to Heywood.
- Clark, A. M., "Thomas Heywood as a Critic" ("Mod. Lang. Notes," April, 1922).

- Dam, B. A. P. van, and C. Stoffel, "The Fifth Act of Thomas Heywood's *Queen Elizabeth*" ("Shakespeare Jahrbuch," 1902, Vol. 38, pp. 153-95).
- Darley, George, "Beaumont and Fletcher and their Contemporaries" ("The Edinburgh Review," 1841, Vol. 73, pp. 209-41).
- Gilbert, A. H., "Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus" ("Journal of English and Germanic Philology," 1913, Vol. 12). A very useful study of Heywood's use of sources.
- Hibbard, Laura A., "The Authorship and Date of 'The Faire Maide of the Exchange'" ("Mod. Philology," 1910, Vol. VII, pp. 383-94). Advocates Heywood's authorship.
- Kittredge, G. R., "Notes on Elizabethan Plays" ("Journal of Germanic Philology," 1898, Vol. 2, p. 13). A brief note on the "Captives."
- Koeppel, E., "Zur Quellen Kunde des Stuart-Dramas," ("Archiv. fur das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen," 1896, Vol. 97, pp. 313-32). For Heywood's "Captives," *vide* pp. 323-29.
- "Studien über Shakespeare's Wirkung auf Zeitgenössische Dramatiker" (Heywood, pp. 11-29). ("Materialien zur kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas," 1905 Vol. IX).
- Mertin, R. G., "A New Source for 'A Woman Killed with Kindness'" ("Englische Studien," 1910, Vol. XLIII, pp. 229-33).
- "Is the 'Late Lancashire Witches' a revision?" ("Mod. Philology," 1915, Vol. XIII, pp. 77-89).
- "A New Specimen of the Revenge Play" ("Mod. Philology," 1918, Vol. XVI, p. 1-10). Demonstrates that "The Iron Age" contains revenge-play elements.
- "Notes on Thomas Heywood's Ages" ("Mod. Lang. Notes," 1918, Vol. 33, pp. 23-30).
- "Retrospective Review, The," 1825, Vol. XI, "The Early Drama—Thomas Heywood's Plays."
- Swinburne, A. C., "The Historical and Classical Plays of Thomas Heywood" ("Nineteenth Century," 1895, Vol. 37, pp. 646-56.) Interesting æsthetic criticism.
- "The Romantic and Contemporary Plays of Thomas Heywood" ("Nineteenth Century," 1895, Vol. 38, pp. 397-410). Companion to the preceding article.
- Symonds, J. Addington, "On the Relations of Painter's 'Palace of Pleasure' to the English Romantic Drama" ("Fortnightly Review," 1891, Vol. LVI, pp. 235-43).

Tutlock, J. S. P., "The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, especially in Shakespeare and Heywood" (Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub., 1915, Vol. 30, pp. 673-770). Among other things, an attempt is made in this to set dates for Heywood's four "Ages."

Thomas, D. L., "On the Play Pericles" ("Englische Studien," 1908, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 210-33). Believes Heywood to be the author of un-Shakespearian scenes.

44273

13.9.68

Q.



ALLAMA IQBAL LIBRARY



44273

2522N
82. P. 51



**ALLAMA
IQBAL LIBRARY**

**UNIVERSITY OF KASHMIR
HELP TO KEEP THIS BOOK
FRESH AND CLEAN**